

# The Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

VOLUME XVI.

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER, is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s., Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 4, 1871.

THE LORDS JUSTICES will hear appeals in bankruptcy on Wednesdays and Thursdays during Michaelmas Term.

AT THE PRESENT MOMENT everyone is asking who are to be the new Privy Council judges under the Judicial Committee Act, and all sorts of *conjectures* are afloat. We may however accept as a certainty the appointment of Mr. Justice Montagu Smith, and for this reason, that it was that judge's turn to be an election judge, instead of which he has been passed over, which can hardly have been for any other reason. As regards Baron Bramwell, it is known that one of the new appointments was offered him, and by him declined, on account of its not providing for his clerks. It is possible, however, that that matter may be arranged.

WE UNDERSTAND that Mr. Mills, one of the taxing-masters of the Court of Chancery, has sent in his resignation, and that Mr. John James Johnson, the solicitor to the Suitors' Fund, has been appointed to the post of taxing-master. It has not as yet been announced who is to succeed Mr. J. J. Johnson as solicitor to the Suitors' Fund, but there is supposed to be some difficulty in the way of awarding any salary to the holder of that appointment. It is certain that the transfer to the Treasury of part of the funds of the Court of Chancery has not abolished the duties which devolved upon Mr. J. J. Johnson.

IN THE CASE of the *Oriental Commercial Bank, Ex parte Morris*, the Lords Justices yesterday varied materially a decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon (reported 19 W. R. 945), as to the extent of the liability of the B. contributories of a company in liquidation. Mr. Morris transferred his shares less than a year before the winding up to a transferee, who became insolvent and never paid anything in respect of the unpaid calls, which

amounted to £800. At the date of the winding up there remained due by the company debts to the amount of £642, which had been contracted before the transfer. In the course of the winding-up, by means of the assets of the company and the contributions of the A. contributories, dividends to the amount of fifteen shillings in the pound were paid upon all the debts of the company, and thus the £642 became reduced to £160 10s. Under these circumstances Vice-Chancellor Bacon prefaced his order with an expression of opinion that each B. contributory was liable to contribute (to an amount not exceeding the calls unpaid on his shares) rateably with the other B. contributories, to the extent of the debts owing by the company when he transferred his shares, and remaining unpaid at the commencement of the winding up, "without any reduction in respect of the dividends upon such debts already paid by the liquidator in the course of the winding up out of the contributions made by the contributories of Class A since the commencement of the winding up, and the other assets of the bank," and the order was that the liquidator do call on Morris for his rateable proportion of the £642, and upon the other B. contributories for their rateable proportions of the debts which were owing by the company at the time they transferred their shares, and remaining due at the commencement of the winding up. The Lords Justices held that the words which we have placed in inverted commas must be omitted from the order, and they added a declaration to the effect that the sums received from the B. contributories must be applied exclusively in paying the B. creditors—i.e. the creditors whose debts were contracted in each case before the B. contributory ceased to be a member. Their Lordships thought that the words which they struck out of the order would, if left standing, render it a direct contravention of the decision of the Full Court in *Brett's case* (19 W. R. 637). The present decision appears completely to overrule the decision of Lord Justice Giffard in *Re The Accidental and Marine Insurance Corporation* (18 W. R. 717) (which, though disapproved of by the Appeal Court in *Brett's case*, was by no means inconsistent with it); but it seems to us still to leave it a very difficult matter to ascertain the exact amount of the liability of each B. contributory. This, however, may be, as Lord Justice James observed, merely an arithmetical difficulty, but it will prove one, we think, by no means easy of solution.

AMONG THE SUFFERERS by the awful conflagration at Chicago is Mrs. Myra Bradwell, editor of the *Chicago Legal News*. Mrs. Bradwell, who is the wife of Bradwell, J., started the *Chicago Legal News* some three or four years ago; thus, as we should imagine, supplying the first instance in which a judge's lady has taken to editing a law newspaper, or, for the matter of that, a newspaper of any kind. She is an uncompromising insister on what are called the rights of women, and would rejoice

to see feminine jurymen in the box, feminine advocates at the bar, and feminine judges on the bench; but she remains lady-like through it all, and has nothing whatever in common with the female rowdies who have been lately adopting the "women's rights ticket" in New York. Her editorial criticisms are very naively American, nor does she scruple, with proper courtesy to differ from Bradwell, J., himself, on a point of law. However, the *Chicago Legal News* office, and all its contents, except the ledger, perished utterly in the late catastrophe. But the editress, though dismayed, was not disheartened. The *Chicago Legal News* is a weekly paper, and true to time, it appeared the Saturday after the fire, though temporarily of a diminished size. This was very plucky of Mrs. Bradwell, and we wish her success. She says that she "will soon right up, and go forward again with the usual amount of reading matter."

IT IS AN ADMITTED PRINCIPLE of international law, that when one state becomes the debtor of subjects of another state, the second state may interfere to protect its own subjects from sustaining pecuniary injury at the hands of the first. But as far as our own country is concerned, it is not customary for the State to undertake the maintenance of the claims of those of its subjects who may happen to be aggrieved as foreign bond-holders. In 1847, Lord George Bentinck moved an address to the Crown, praying that her Majesty would be graciously pleased to take such steps as might be deemed advisable to secure for the British holders of unpaid foreign bonds, redress from the respective Governments. Lord Palmerston, in opposing the motion, said foreign governments would not be safe in presuming on what had been the established practice in England. The time might come when public opinion and the votes of Parliament would force the Government of Great Britain to insist on the payment of debts due to British subjects. England, he trusted, would always have the means of obtaining justice for its subjects from any country upon the face of the earth. Next year Lord Palmerston, as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, issued a circular instruction to all our foreign representatives, in which he stated that successive Governments of Great Britain had hitherto considered it undesirable to encourage British subjects embarking their capital in hazardous foreign loans, and on that ground had abstained from taking up the complaints made by injured bondholders, &c. But it was always on the cards that the Government might think it well to interfere, for instance, if the case assumed such a magnitude that the loss to British subjects seemed too high a price to pay for the warning. So the matter rests; and no one, we imagine, would be found to urge that it behoves this country to take part against Spain, on behalf of those who have chosen to put faith in the promises of that inveterately bankrupt and faithless Power.

Another topic exhibiting a similar subject, but under a different aspect, is that of the Confederate Loans, to which many people subscribed in England. Some of the New York papers have been wondering whether any claims on behalf of these bondholders would be made under the Washington Convention, and deprecating any such claims strongly. This point much resembles that put forward by Lord Redesdale some while ago, *opropos* of the effect, on the claims of the North in respect of *Alabama* injuries inflicted on her by the South, of the subsequent re-union of the North and South. The Confederate States contracted loans, and if they had remained a single Power would have been responsible to the subscribers. Then must not the North, having, so to speak, taken the South into partnership, take them with all equities against them; and are not these debts, to follow up the similitude, proveable against the partnership? That is the form the question takes, but there is this further question, whether, as against the North, the South really was to

be considered in the light, not only of a belligerent, but of a foreign power, capable of contracting loans.

THE STRANGE STATE OF UNCERTAINTY in which we live as to what our future judicial system is to be, receives a new illustration in the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Tribunals of Commerce. This report is a production of a wholly different kind from the absurd bill brought into the House of Commons last session; but it contains propositions which we think are not likely, at present at least, to receive legislative sanction.

Probably no one denies that the administration of justice ought to be a simpler matter than it is now, but it is of no use trying to effect impossibilities, though there are some people, we fancy, who think they ought to be able to transact their pecuniary differences by some process as simple as buying a stamp. We shall, however, return to this again; meanwhile, the report of the Committee runs as follows. After describing at some length the Tribunal of Commerce system, as in operation in some foreign countries, France especially, the Committee proceed to what we may term the operative part of their report. They say:—

"It is worthy of observation that, whilst the commercial classes in England are obliged to submit their disputes to the Superior Courts, with their complex legal machinery, the public has, at the same time, recognised, for its own protection and convenience, the propriety of a more simple, expeditious, and inexpensive procedure for a large class of cases which come within the criminal law. Though the reputation or liberty of the subject is often seriously affected by a criminal prosecution, no difficulty seems to be experienced in the prosecutor attending before a single justice of the peace, who generally is not a lawyer, for the purpose of making a statement of his complaint, or in the justice of the peace issuing a summons, or even a warrant, to compel the defendant to appear before him on the next day, or in then proceeding with the trial of the case, either alone or with another justice of the peace, or adjourning it from time to time until it is decided, if it be within summary jurisdiction, or until the case has been committed for trial to another court.

With few exceptions the county court is the only local tribunal for the administration of civil justice. Its compulsory jurisdiction is limited to claims of small amount, except where the court is invested with the power of a court of equity or of admiralty, when the jurisdiction extends to matters varying in value for the several classes of cases up to £1,000, and excepting where the court has the power of a court of bankruptcy, when the jurisdiction is unlimited. But whilst the Royal Judicature Commission is still prosecuting its labours to determine in what manner justice should be administered by the several local courts and the superior courts, your committee have not thought it expedient to attempt to engraft the system of tribunals of commerce upon any of the existing courts of justice. Yet in any reorganisation of the judicial system of the country it seems to your committee that the county courts might form a convenient and economic basis for the establishment of such tribunals.

Your committee would not interfere with the ordinary jurisdiction of the County Courts for sums under £20, but they are of opinion that a tribunal of commerce should be established in such of the large towns throughout the country as might be selected as centres of surrounding districts, having regard to the population and commercial activity of each district; and that the court should be composed of one member of the legal profession as the president, and of two other members selected from the commercial classes for the office of commercial judge, with a registrar to carry on the routine business of the court. Some approach to this system was made when the admiralty jurisdiction was conferred on the county courts. The judge in these cases is assisted by two nautical assessors, and it appears from the evidence that the court so constituted gives great satisfaction. Should the business of the tribunal be so extensive as not to admit of the county court judge and registrar conducting the business of the court, the president and registrar should be appointed by the Crown. The selection of the commercial members of the court is by no means free from difficulty. It will be seen

from the paper recently laid before the French Chamber, and translated in the appendix, that several changes have taken place in the mode of making the selection in France which have been greatly influenced by political considerations; but as the sole object of appointing the commercial judges is to secure impartial and intelligent judges, in whom those subject to the jurisdiction of the tribunal may have confidence, your committee are of opinion that this object would be best attained by empowering the Lord Chancellor to appoint persons engaged in business in the district, of the highest probity and reputation, to be commercial judges.

The number of the mercantile judges to be appointed for each court should be proportioned to the business to be conducted; so that each judge would only be required to attend the court for a limited period. The attendance might ordinarily be by rotation, reserving to the legal judge the power of selecting from the mercantile judges those skilled in the business out of which the dispute may have arisen, whenever it might be found to be desirable. The office of commercial judge, like that of a justice of the peace, should be regarded as an honorary duty, not as a source of emolument.

The jurisdiction of the tribunals should be compulsory and exclusive over all causes which might be classified as commercial, either according to the French classification, or according to that which has prevailed in the country, in discriminating between the trader and the non-trader under the bankruptcy laws. The fact that special tribunals so long existed with a jurisdiction over traders alone for the administration of those laws shows that no practical difficulty need be apprehended on this point.

It appears to your committee that in order to derive all the benefit expected from a Tribunal of Commerce, it is essential that the procedure should be of the simplest and most summary character, like that before the Tribunal of Commerce in France, or before justices of the peace in this country. The complainant should be at liberty to attend before judge or registrar to prefer his complaint, and obtain a summons returnable at any time according to the nature of the case. The defendant should appear in person or through an agent to answer the complaint, and further stages of the proceedings if required should be regulated by the circumstances of the dispute so as to bring the case to a speedy termination.

Your committee think it undesirable to exclude altogether the intervention of professional legal agents. They would, therefore, recommend that counsel and attorneys should be admitted to assist the parties, without superseding their personal attendance, as your committee are of opinion that in the greater number of cases the tribunal would be able to dispose of the complaint on the first appearance of the parties, by unravelling the cause of dispute and suggesting a fair and reasonable adjustment of their differences, without even resorting to a formal decision; and that in many other cases the tribunal would be enabled to decide on the admitted facts whilst they were fresh in the recollection of the disputants. A small number of cases, however, would present features of legal complexity which might deserve the consideration of a higher tribunal. Your committee believe that the present system of appeal from the country courts and from magistrates has been found sufficient for the protection of the suitor from injustice. They, therefore, think that a similar system of appeal might be adopted for the tribunals of commerce. In any case under £500, the appeal should only be allowed with the sanction of the court, and above that amount it should be allowed on the demand of either party.

Without knowing what other changes may be introduced into the judicial system of the country, your committee are unable to determine whether any additional expense would be occasioned by the establishment of tribunals of commerce. But it seems to your committee that if a reasonable scale of fees were charged for the business transacted, the receipts would be sufficient to cover the expenditure. The withdrawal of all commercial causes, in the first instance, from the superior courts would afford a reasonable expectation that the number of judges of those courts might be diminished, so that the saving of charges on that account would be equal to any deficiency arising from the expense of the tribunals of commerce."

James Armstrong, Esq., has been appointed Chief Justice of the Island of Saint Lucia.

# FRIENDLY AND OTHER SOCIETIES, AND THEIR EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION.

The statutory protection and favour which has been extended to societies, formed to enable persons of small means to furnish each other with mutual assistance, together with their own proper convenience and utility, has had the effect of giving them a vigour and spread, which seem now to make some of the exceptional privileges they enjoy of doubtful propriety. These societies fall under the four principal heads of friendly societies, loan societies, industrial societies, and benefit building societies. The first were established originally under 33 Geo. 3, c. 54, "for raising (as the preamble of the statute says) by voluntary subscriptions of the members thereof separate funds for the mutual relief and maintenance of the said members in sickness, old age, and infirmity." By 59 Geo. 4, c. 128 (after some intervening Acts of less importance), further provisions were made as to their rules and proceedings, and by section 2 they are described as societies "whereby it is intended to provide by contribution, on the principle of mutual insurance, for the maintenance or assistance of the contributors thereto, their wives or children, in sickness, infancy, advanced age, widowhood, or any other natural state or contingency, whereof the occurrence is susceptible of calculation by way of average." The same description is repeated in 10 Geo. 4, c. 56, s. 2, which repealed all the previous Acts, and consolidated the law upon the subject; but 4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 40, s. 2, extended the description by the addition of the words, "or for any other purpose which is not illegal." What other purposes were meant to be included is not clear; but whatever they were, no very wide limit was left to them by Wightman, J., who decided in the *Queen v. Scott* (3 Jur. 473, 13 L. J. M. C. 70), that they must be "such as may in some sort form the subject of calculation" beforehand; and partly on that ground, partly on the ground that loan societies were expressly provided for by another later statute (5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 23), and partly on the ground that if these general words were allowed to include loan societies there would be nothing to prevent their application to societies lending to strangers, held that a society for mutual lending was not sanctioned by the Act. This decision was followed by 9 & 10 Vict. c. 27, which, by section 1, defined the purposes for which a society might be established, which were (1) life insurance; (2) relief, maintenance, or endowment of the members, their husbands, wives, children, kindred, or nominees, in infancy, old age, sickness, widowhood, or any other natural state of which the probability may be calculated by way of average; (3) loss by fire, flood, or shipwreck, or by any contingency, of which the probability may be calculated by way of average; (4) the frugal investment of the savings of the members for better enabling them to purchase food, firing, clothes, or other necessities, or the tools or implements of their trade or calling, or to provide for the education of their children, or kindred—the shares not to be transferrable, to be for the sole benefit of the investing member, his or her husband, wife, children, or kindred—the member on withdrawing to receive the full amount of the balance due to him by the rules of the society, and the society not to invest with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; (5) any other purpose certified by the Attorney or Solicitor General, or a Secretary of State, but the sum assured to each member not to exceed £200, and this society, also, not to invest with the Commissioners. This statute, together with 10 Geo. 4, c. 56, and 4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 40, was in its turn repealed by 13 & 14 Vict. c. 115, which however (section 2) defined the purposes almost in the same terms; adding, however, as a sixth purpose, that of assisting the members, their wives, &c., to emigrate, and also adding the general limitation, that the sum assured to a member for any of the purposes enumerated should not exceed £100, nor an annuity exceed £30, nor a weekly sum in sickness exceed 20s. This Act, which



was a temporary Act, after being continued through some sessions, was repealed by 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, which simplified the purposes, as enumerated in 9 & 10 Vict. c. 27, and 13 & 14 Vict. c. 115, by striking out all but the first, second, and fifth; omitted all reference under these heads to calculation by way of average; and increased the sum which might be assured to £200. This Act still remains, unaltered in its general provisions by the amending Acts of 21 & 22 Vict. c. 101, and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 58 and c. 137. From the whole series of these Acts it is clear that the societies contemplated by them were meant to be strictly limited to the purpose of accumulating a common fund, out of which each member might receive on a specified contingency, not his own particular investment, either in its original amount or with accumulations, but such a sum as the rules of the society might entitle him to; the only purpose mentioned by the statutes which has a different aspect, that numbered 4 in 9 & 10 Vict. c. 27, and 13 & 14 Vict. c. 115 (itself of very limited scope), having been omitted from the Act of 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63.

Secondly, "Institutions for establishing loan funds," described in very obscure language as societies formed "for the purpose of establishing a society for a loan fund for the industrious classes, &c., and receiving back payment for the same by instalments," were protected by 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 23, and more elaborately provided for by the temporary Act of 3 & 4 Vict. c. 110, repealing the former Act, and which has been made perpetual by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 56. It is singular that though these Acts limit the amount of the loans to be made by them to any one person at the same time to £15, no limit is set to the amount which may be lent to the society by any one person. In fact there is neither anything to secure that the funds shall be the result of the united subscriptions of persons of moderate means, nor is any mutuality whatever required in the transaction, except the mutuality of lender and borrower, and there is nothing to prevent a single capitalist from supplying the funds, and working the whole machinery of a so-called society, thus lending his money with the advantage of summary methods of enforcing repayment.

Thirdly, as to industrial and provident societies, formed for the purpose of carrying on any trade or business, except banking, since 25 & 26 Vict. c. 87 (which in repealing 15 & 16 Vict. c. 31, took away nearly all their distinctive features) and 30 & 31 Vict. c. 117, they seem to differ but little from ordinary joint stock companies, except in the absence of any provisions with respect to share capital, in the application to them of the exemptions and the summary jurisdiction applicable to friendly societies, and in the limitation of the interest of any member to £200. The provisions of the Acts seem in the highest degree vague and flexible in their application.

Lastly benefit building societies were constituted by 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 32, "for the purpose of raising by small periodical subscriptions a fund to assist the members thereof in obtaining a small freehold or leasehold property." The Act (section 1) empowered persons to form themselves into societies for the purpose of raising, by monthly or other subscriptions of the several members, in shares not exceeding £150 each, such subscriptions not to exceed 20s. a month for each share, a stock or fund "for the purpose of enabling each member to receive out of the funds of the society the amount or value of his or her share or shares therein to erect or purchase one or more dwelling house or dwelling houses or other real or leasehold estate, to be secured by way of mortgage to the society until the amount or value of his or her shares shall have been fully repaid to such society, with the interest thereon, and all fines and other payments incurred in respect thereof.

To these societies the provisions of the Friendly Societies Acts (10 Geo. 4, c. 56, and 4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 40) were extended. Their mode of operation, in contrast with freehold land societies is shortly and clearly

expressed in the following terms:—"A freehold land society buys land with the funds subscribed by the members, and then divides that land among them; but a benefit building society advances to members out of the subscriptions made by the members, sums of money to be laid out in the purchase of land or buildings, which are then mortgaged to the society" (per Lord Romilly, M.R., in *Grimes v. Harrison*, 26 Beav. 435).

Thus the purpose of the first class of societies is the insurance of various contingencies in small sums; that of the second, the obtaining of small advances on loans; that of the third, the carrying on of business by the co-operation of small capitalists; that of the fourth, the acquisition of land or houses by small owners, through mutual accommodation. All of them are favoured by an exemption from stamp duty of the instruments required or authorised by the Acts under which they are constituted (18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, s. 37; 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 32 s. 4; 3 & 4 Vict. c. 110 s. 14; 25 & 26 Vict. c. 87, s. 15).

Now, so far as these associations have proved successful, their success has justified the legislation which created them, and furnishes no ground of complaint; so far from being a reason for destroying the machinery, it is its best recommendation. But the exemption of their transactions from the ordinary burdens of taxation requires very clear proof to justify it. If that taxation is so burdensome as to clog the machinery for working them, and prevent it from having the intended operation; it is a strong argument that the system of taxation is vicious. If the exemption is so important as to give them a factitious popularity and success, it goes beyond enabling, and is in the nature of protective legislation, and cannot be justified on sound principles; and its great importance also leads to the suspicion that the rate or method of taxation is at fault. If no such considerable effect follows it needs to be shown why, in addition to the special facilities of the machinery, the sum which would otherwise be paid to the revenue should be presented to the societies.

Now, with respect to this point, three facts are important to notice; first, that the stamp duties are now on a far lower scale than they were at the time when this legislation commenced; second, that the societies have far outgrown the dimensions originally contemplated; but, third, they still deal to a large extent with a great number of small payments, the stamp duty on which would be, comparatively speaking, heavy. The first two considerations are certainly opposed to the continuance of the exemption; the third, which is in favour of it, is deprived of much of its force by the first, and also by the consideration that even without the exemption, several of the documents enumerated in 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, s. 37, would not be liable to any stamp duty. Almost all duties which are not *ad valorem* are now so low as not to be felt as any serious burden in the particular case, though the aggregate of them might amount to a considerable revenue, and such as are *ad valorem* duties may be assumed to be equitably adjusted. The occasion which provokes these observations is the decision pronounced in the case of *Attorney-General v. Gilpin* (19 W. R. 1027, L. R. 6 Ex. 193), and the facts which there appeared as to the society whose trustees were defendants. The society was called a benefit building society; the shares in it were of £30 each, and might be either paid by monthly instalments (which, however, were not enforced) or paid up at once, or advanced to members out of money in hand; interest was paid up on completed shares, and uncompleted shares were credited with profits; either the whole or any part of the money standing to the credit of a member might be withdrawn on a twenty-eight days' notice and on production of his pass-book (though payment was, in fact, usually made within a week), except that completed shares could only be withdrawn entire, there was no limit to the number of shares in the society, or to the number which any member might



hold, and anyone could take a share on paying a fee of 1s.; the society did not take any part in providing its members with land or houses, except by advancing them money on mortgage, and this it equally did to persons who were not members. The amounts of half-yearly interest, as well as of withdrawals, were paid by cheques payable to bearer, drawn by the member who was to receive the money upon the society, on a printed form obtained from the secretary. The amount standing to the credit of the members exceeded a million sterling. The question arose whether these drafts required a stamp, or whether they were within the exemption. The Court held that they required stamping as not being required or authorised either by the Act or the rules, and they limited the drafts and orders mentioned in the clause of exemption to drafts or orders drawn by an officer of the society for its purposes, or by a member upon the society payable to himself only. But they also expressed a strong opinion that the operations described were not those of a benefit building society or a friendly society, but of a banking society, and were neither within the letter or spirit of the Acts.

This decision is, we believe, on its way to the Exchequer Chamber, and it is no doubt of such importance to the societies as to induce them to use all efforts to obtain its reversal. But whether it is or is not correct (though we see no reason to question it), there can be no doubt that the society in question, however useful and convenient, was in no respect of the character contemplated by 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 32, nor within any of the other favoured classes. The application of the statutory machinery to such a widely different purpose from that which it was intended to serve, seems to give a fit opportunity for reconsidering the propriety of the exemptions from stamp duty; and the success and popularity of such societies (of which we believe the one in question is only a considerable example) gives good reason to think that their usefulness would not be impaired or their operations unduly burdened by their sharing in the common burdens of taxation, while it might perhaps be desirable to remove by legislation the doubt which had been cast upon the legality of their proceedings, and to give them in legislative sanction as extended a scope as they have already acquired in practice. But in doing so, it would also be worth while to consider whether it would or would not be desirable to limit the number of shares which each member might hold, as well as the amount of the shares themselves; and whether the so-called "institutions for establishing loan funds" are really of any service to the community.

## RECENT DECISIONS.

### BANKRUPTCY.

#### BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 72—JURISDICTION OF COURTS OF BANKRUPTCY.

*Ex parte Wood, re Taylor and Rumbold*, C.J.B., 19 W. R. 601.

*Ex parte Rumbold, re Taylor and Rumbold*, L.J.J., 19 W. R. 1102.

*Macdonald v. Purvis, In re Beveridge*, C.J.B., 19 W. R. 717.

In *Ex parte Anderson* (18 W. R. 715), it was decided by Giffard, L.J., sitting on appeal from the Court of Bankruptcy, that under section 72 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, a Court of Bankruptcy has now jurisdiction, not only, as of old, to decide all questions between parties to the bankruptcy, the trustee, the bankrupt, the creditors who have proved, and so on, but to decide questions affecting total strangers to the bankruptcy who may not only not desire to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of the court, but may as far as in them lies refuse to do so; jurisdiction "to decide everything that may be considered necessary with a view to the distribution of the bankrupt's estate." And the Lord Justice further decides that this jurisdiction may be exercised in the

case of bankruptcies commenced under the Act of 1861, as well as those commenced under the new Act.

In *Ex parte Wood*, Bacon, C.J., carried this doctrine one step further by holding that it applies not only to bankruptcies proper, under whichever Act commenced, but likewise to composition deeds under the Act of 1861, and in *Ex parte Rumbold* the Lords Justices affirmed this decision.

In *Macdonald v. Purvis*, Bacon, C.J., affirmed the order of a county court, restraining an action in the Court of Queen's Bench by a stranger to the bankruptcy against the trustee, to recover a sum of money received by the trustee, but to which the plaintiff alleged that neither the bankrupt, nor the trustee claiming under him, had any title. That the county court had jurisdiction to make the order in question followed clearly from the decision in *Ex parte Anderson*. We refer to the case because the remarks of the Chief Judge throw light upon the spirit in which he holds that this jurisdiction ought to be exercised. "The policy of the law," he says, "is that in bankruptcy or quasi bankruptcy there shall be one tribunal for the determination of all questions arising in, belonging to, or which can relate to it." It appears, therefore, that a judge in bankruptcy ought ordinarily to restrain any proceeding pending in any other court in any way affecting the bankrupt's estate.

#### SPECIAL RESOLUTION OF CREDITORS—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 28—POWER OF THE COURT.

*Ex parte Hunt, In re Winn*, C.J.B., 19 W. R. 714.

The very first principle upon which the bankruptcy legislation of 1869 was founded is that in cases of bankruptcy or quasi bankruptcy the creditors represented by the statutory majority, and not the Court, shall determine upon the disposition of their debtor's effects; though in some cases, for the protection, no doubt, of minorities, a veto upon what is proposed by the majority is given to the Court. Thus by section 28, "The trustee may, with the sanction of a special resolution of the creditors assembled at any meeting, &c., accept any composition, &c., or assent to any general scheme of settlement of the affairs of the bankrupt, &c., subject nevertheless to the approval of the Court to be testified by the judge signing, &c."

In the case now under review the Chief Judge has decided that the power of the judge under this section is a mere veto; it is limited to simply accepting or rejecting the resolution; he cannot alter it.

#### BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 13—INJUNCTION—EXECUTION ON OTHER LEGAL PROCESS.

*Ex parte Birmingham and Staffordshire Gas Light Company, In re Fanshaw and Young*, C.J.B., 19 W. R. 608.

*Ex parte Hughes, In re Browne*, C.J.B., 19 W. R. 771.

These two cases are instructive as throwing light upon the construction of section 13 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, the section perhaps of the whole which has to be most frequently acted upon.

It enacts that "the Court may, at any time after the presentation of a bankruptcy petition against the debtor, restrain further proceedings in any action, suit, execution, or other legal process against the debtor in respect of any debt provable in bankruptcy." And by the joint operation of section 125 and Rule 260, that law is the same where a petition for liquidation is presented. What then is a legal process within the meaning of this section?

In *Ex parte Birmingham and Staffordshire Gas Light Company*, a gas company was bound to supply gas to the public, and by its special Act it was enacted that "if any person supplied with gas by the company shall neglect to pay any rent or charge due to the company . . . the company may recover the rent or charge due from such person, if less than £20, by the same means as landlords are by law empowered to recover rent in arrear."

A debtor presented a petition for liquidation, and after the petition the gas company distrained the debtor's goods for arrears of charges for gas supplied by them. This proceeding it was sought to restrain. The learned Chief Judge held that the distress could not be restrained. It was not a "legal process" within the meaning of section 13, for a distress is carried into effect by the mere act of the party distraining, not by the intervention of a court of justice. And moreover the special Act placed the gas company on the same footing with landlords distraining. And the landlord's right of distress, notwithstanding bankruptcy, is expressly protected by section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act.

In *Ex parte Hughes*, the learned judge decided that there is no difference between a sequestration issuing out of the Court of Chancery and an execution at common law for the purposes of section 13 of the Bankruptcy Act already cited; but that the former as well as the latter may be restrained under that section.

### REVIEWS.

*Commentaries upon International Law.* By Sir ROBERT PHILLIMORE, D.C.L., member of her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, and judge of the High Court of Admiralty. Vol. ii., second edition. London: Butterworths.

Nearly twelve months ago (15 S. J. 176) we were called on to review the first volume of the second edition of Sir Robert Phillimore's book on International Law. The second volume is now issued, and demands our notice. Upon the general character of the work we need add nothing to the criticism passed in our notice of the first volume. For a book written by an English judge of Admiralty, the work is a disappointing one. Though rife with learning and research, it is not a book which deals with principles; there seems no grasp in it. Yet we must not convey the idea that the work is not calculated to be a useful one, because such is far from being the case. Authorities are quoted and referred to comprehensively as well as voluminously, and the work may be said to comprise the materials for the solution of all questions bearing on international law, so far as any authorities exist. Thus the work will be found a useful one, especially so by those who can handle and form their own conclusions from the mass of matter which Sir R. Phillimore lays before them.

The subject matter of vol. ii. comprises—(part 5) The Right of Protecting Citizens in Foreign Countries; Obligations in respect of State Debts; Recognition; Treaties and Guarantees, and their interpretations. (Part 6) Rights of Sovereigns and Embassies. (Part 7.) Consuls. (Part 9) International Status of Foreign Spiritual Powers, especially of the Pope.

### COURTS.

#### VICE-CHANCELLOR WICKENS.

##### WESTMINSTER.

Nov. 2.—*Course of business—Adjourned summonses.*

WICKENS, V.C., addressing Mr. Greene, Q.C., said it might be convenient to the bar and to the profession to know that it was his intention to have in future the adjourned summonses placed in the papers of the day by themselves; and there being no objection to that course, he would take them after the petitions and short causes upon Fridays and Saturdays respectively.

Greene, Q.C., on behalf of the bar, said the course proposed would be a very great improvement upon the old practice of taking adjourned summonses with motions on Thursdays.

#### JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

(Before MARTIN, B.)

Oct. 28.—*Debtor's Act—New Regulation.*

In two cases under the Debtor's Act, in which application was made for commitment for non-payment, MARTIN, B., ordered notice to be given, and made an order

that payment be made in a week, or the parties be committed for six weeks.

### BANKRUPTCY COURT.

LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

(Before Mr. Registrar ROCHER, acting as Chief Judge.)

Oct. 28.—*Re Aylott.*

*Brough*, on behalf of the receiver under a petition for liquidation filed by Samuel Aylott, said he was instructed to bring before the notice of the Court the fact that on the 21st inst., being four days after the date of the petition, a circular had been addressed to the creditors by an association called the Anti-Bankruptcy Association, in these terms:—  
"The Anti-Bankruptcy Association, Offices, Weavers' Hall, 22, Basinghall-street, London, E.C.,  
October 21st, 1871.

Sir,—Should you be unable to attend the meeting of creditors personally in the matter of Mr. Samuel Aylott, of 4, Darling-place, Mile End, you are solicited to forward your proof of debt, duly sworn, to these offices on or before the 4th November, 1871.

We are concerned for creditors, and shall represent them at the meeting to be held at 158, Fenchurch-street on the 6th of November next, being desirous of securing on their behalf a good composition settlement in lieu of the expenses and heavy costs generally incurred by liquidation or bankruptcy.

Under these circumstances I trust you will co-operate with the creditors for whom we are acting, and thus support us in carrying out the objects we have in view.

Enclosed is a form of proxy for your signature, which, please, have duly sworn and returned at your earliest convenience.

Yours respectfully,

T. C. E. HELMORE, Secretary.

Objects of the association:—

This association has been formed by the wholesale merchants of London to protect themselves from unnecessary losses and heavy costs being incurred under failures which may arise from time to time, and for attending on their behalf meetings of creditors called under liquidation or otherwise, either in London or various parts of England (where practicable); to render every assistance to its members in the investigation of debtors' estates, and to see that the composition offered is equivalent to the value of the assets, &c., free of any charge except the annual subscription.

To supply a great want felt by the wholesale trader under the present system of the bankruptcy law, viz:—

By establishing a safe medium whereby creditors can rely upon their interests being protected, and know in whose hands their proof of debt and proxy have been placed—a difficulty now severely felt by all under the working of the present Act—it being in many instances an impossibility for each individual creditor to be present at meetings called under liquidation or otherwise held at distant parts of the country in consequence of the numerous expenses thereby incurred, but by this medium of co-operation it is intended to overcome the difficulty and thus avoid the heavy losses which too frequently occur from the want of such assistance as is offered by this association, as it very often occurs that estates revert with bankruptcy or into the accountant's hands to wind up when a more advantageous mode of settlement could be carried out than the swallowing up of the bulk of estates in useless bankruptcy and professional expenses.

The principle upon which this association will at all times act in failures under its management will be to carry out and procure, if possible, payment by secured promissory notes on all amounts proved above £10, so that each creditor will at once obtain his dividend and a negotiable security, which is far preferable at all times to commercial men than the tedious delays generally caused before declaring the payment of dividends. By this mode of settlement no costs or expenses will fall upon the creditors; but whatever expenses incurred by this association, which at no time will amount to much, will have to be paid by the debtor personally.

The association makes inquiries for its members into estates either under liquidation or bankruptcy in cases where any trustee appointed may have paid no dividend or where creditors are dissatisfied with the amount paid by the trustee.

Book debts collected, and back unpaid dividends searched for and recovered for members.

No expense is incurred by non-members entrusting the association with their proofs (when acting for any of its members), the same being provided for out of the funds of the association; and London creditors can have their proofs prepared and sworn (free of charge) at the solicitors' department by attending in person or by a clerk in their employ duly authorised to prove.

N.B.—Non-members who desire to avail themselves of the advantages of the association can obtain full particulars from the secretary, and, should they wish it, be furnished with the names of some of the most influential houses who are subscribers.

The annual subscription is two guineas or three guineas, which will include the Weekly Official List (post free) of all failures in each respective trade to which the member belongs.

The association has an efficient staff of clerks in various departments, and agents in many important towns, which enables it to render the greatest possible assistance to members when failures occur.

P.S.—All cash payments and letters should be addressed to the secretary, Mr. T. O. E. Helmore."

Accompanying the circular was a form of proof (the description of the debtor being incorrectly copied), to which was appended a note: "If the creditor cannot attend the meeting personally it is absolutely necessary that this proxy should be signed and returned to 22, Basinghall-street on or before the 4th November next." Then followed a blank form of proxy to be filled up by the creditor, and appointing Mr. John Robert Taylor, Arthur Shippey, Charles Helmore, or Edwin Vagg, of 22, Basinghall-street in the City of London, or either of them proxy in the above matter.

Brough said that the circular in question had been issued without the knowledge of the debtor or his solicitor or the receiver, and he complained that the proceedings of the Court had been unwarrantably interfered with. The mystery was how access had been obtained to the list of creditors, for the debtor was prepared to state that he had not furnished a copy to anyone except to the officer at Quality Court.

Mr. Registrar ROCHE.—Is the association registered?

Brough.—It does not appear from the circular whether it is so or not, but the members profess to collect debts and do transact other business which is usually performed by a solicitor. He submitted that the system of touting disclosed by the circular could not be tolerated.

Mr. Registrar ROCHE, said the receiver had acted very properly in calling the attention of the Court to the circulars. Under the old law it was well-known that letters of this nature were forwarded to creditors, and very often the administration of an estate was by these means entrusted to persons of whom the creditors knew nothing. He was sorry to find that under the present statute which was supposed to transfer the management of bankrupt estate to the creditors themselves, an attempt should be made to deprive them of what was undoubtedly a great privilege by the Anti-Bankruptcy Association. Of the association itself the Court knew nothing, but doubtless publicity would be given to the complaint which had been made, and creditors be put on their guard. The important matter was that the records of the Court had apparently been tampered with, and some person must have communicated to the association the names of the creditors as appearing on the list filed in Quality Court. That was a subject which the Court was bound to investigate, and a direction would be given to Mr. Aldridge to ascertain whether the list had been improperly given out to be copied, and if any person connected with the Court had been in communication with the association, he would take care that the law was enforced against him.

Solicitor for the receiver, C. J. Holmes.

Oct. 30.—Mr. Penn, the Chief officer in the Registry in Quality Court attended this morning and explained that a copy of the list of creditors had been furnished upon a request being lodged in the usual form signed by a person named Vagg as appearing for Mr. W. H. Cattlin, solicitor\* on behalf of Messrs. Cox, Bros., of Bristol, who were creditors. He stated that the officials were particularly careful that

copies were furnished only to parties entitled to them, but it was sometimes difficult to ascertain whether or not an applicant was so entitled.

Mr. Registrar ROCHE said that an impression seemed to have prevailed that the proceedings had been handed over to a law stationer to copy.

Mr. Penn said this was not the case.

Mr. Registrar ROCHE was glad to find that the inquiry had produced the result which he had anticipated, and that as far as the office was concerned everything was regular. It seemed that the application for a copy of the list was made by some one in connection with the association who represented that he was acting for a creditor. What he alluded to on Saturday was the system of accountants obtaining information by some extraordinary process, and then sending circulars all round. He understood that Mr. Registrar Hazlitt had produced some of these circulars to the Chief Judge.

Mr. Penn did not think the information could have been obtained in Quality Court. The subject then dropped.

(Before Mr. Registrar BROUGHAM, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Nov. 2.—*In re Tatham.*  
*Composition—Injunction.*

Finlay Knight moved *ex parte* under the failure of Albert John Tatham, described as a lime merchant, of South Wharf, Paddington, for an interim order restraining further proceedings in an action which had been prosecuted by a creditor after the passing of a resolution by creditors for acceptance of a composition of five shillings in the pound.

Mr. Registrar BROUGHAM thought that resolutions accepting a composition did not affect the rights and remedies of creditors to the same extent as did resolutions for liquidation by arrangement. The Court could not grant an injunction, but notice might be given to the other side to bring on the matter for argument if counsel should so advise.

*Costs of counsel.*

A case of *Re G. F. Launcefield* having been disposed of, the Court having granted the application, which was for the appointment of a receiver and an interim injunction restraining actions,

Reed called attention to a rule which had recently been promulgated, and by which it appeared that the fee payable to counsel on making these applications would not be allowed by the taxing master, unless the Court at the time such applications were made should certify that there were special circumstances to justify the employment of counsel. He contended that these applications were from their nature of sufficient importance to be made by counsel, and that the rule had been made to correct a practice which had crept in of solicitors in the country making out separate bills charging for instructions to counsel in as many actions as were sought to be restrained.

Mr. Registrar BROUGHAM thought that in the face of the rule the costs of employing counsel in these matters in the first instance could not be allowed unless under special circumstances. Such applications were generally granted as a matter of course, upon a statement of the facts contained in the papers submitted to the Court, and no argument was necessary. The rule, however, did not apply to applications for the extension of injunctions, which stood upon a different footing, and might be open to argument. In the present case he could discover no special circumstances, and must decline to make any order upon the subject.

## COUNTY COURTS.

HEREFORD.

(Before J. W. SMITH, Esq.)  
Oct. 26.—*Re William Watkins.*  
*Bankruptcy.*

*Held, that a creditor has a right to appear in opposition to a petition for adjudication by another creditor.*

In this case Mr. Bodenham (instructed by Mr. Osborne, of Ross) applied to the court to have the debtor, William Watkins, adjudicated a bankrupt on the petition of the trustees of the Ross Friendly Society.

Mr. Garrold (instructed by Mr. Williams, of Ross) appeared on behalf of Mr. P. S. McDougall, of Ross, banker, a creditor of the debtor, to oppose the adjudication.

Mr. Bodenham, on making the application to have the debtor adjudicated a bankrupt, said that he understood Mr. Garrold appeared to oppose on behalf of a creditor, but he

\* In reference to the above report Mr. J. N. Mason, solicitor of 7, Gresham-street, writes:—"As solicitor for Messrs. Cox & Bros., I am authorised to say that they never sanctioned the request of Mr. Vagg or of Mr. Cattlin. Neither Messrs. Cox, Bros., nor myself have had any communication on this matter with Mr. Vagg or Mr. Cattlin or the association with which they are connected, and the use of Messrs. Cox, Brothers' name is therefore entirely unauthorised."



should submit to his Honour that Mr. Garrold had no *locus standi* there at all, and could not interfere on behalf of any creditor, inasmuch as the only person who could oppose the adjudication was the debtor himself, and he had not given the requisite notice of his intention to defend the application.

Mr. Garrold said he should strongly contend that he had a right to appear in the matter on behalf of Mr. McDougall, who was a creditor, and would be injured by the debtor being made a bankrupt.

Mr. Bodenham said it was clear Mr. Garrold had no right to appear. First of all, there was no proof before the court that Mr. McDougall was a creditor; and, if there had been proof, there was no affidavit of the debt being due, and indeed, no affidavit could be made until after the debtor had been adjudicated a bankrupt. When that had been done he admitted that Mr. Garrold, on behalf of his client, would have a right to apply to the court to annul the adjudication on any grounds he might think proper to adduce, but until then Mr. Garrold's client had no interest whatever in the proceedings, was not in any shape before the court, and certainly could not be heard that day.

Mr. SMITH: Can you, Mr. Garrold, show me any authority by which you claim a right to oppose the adjudication?

Mr. Garrold said he could not, inasmuch as the Bankruptcy Act and rules were silent on the point, and dealt only with the notices and steps that a debtor would have to take if he wished to oppose the adjudication. He contended, however, that no authority was required. The whole purview and intention of the Bankruptcy Act and laws was to deal out justice and equity to all alike, and to give every creditor a voice in all proceedings in bankruptcy in respect of his debtor, and under that intention, and by virtue of the force of the Act as a whole, he claimed a right to appear and be heard. Moreover, the 71st section of the Act enacted that any person aggrieved by an order of a local court might appeal to the Chief Judge. If the debtor in this case were adjudicated a bankrupt, an order which Mr. McDougall might appeal against would have been made. It would therefore be absurd to suppose that power was to be given to a creditor to appeal to a superior court on a matter in the local court in which he had had no voice, and to which he had not been a party. If the judge excluded his (Mr. Garrold's) appearing to-day, it would be probable that a person would be made a bankrupt when he ought not to be, and, moreover, it would put his client to the expense and trouble of making subsequent applications to annul the bankruptcy, when, by his appearing and arguing the matter out that day, an adjudication might perhaps be prevented.

Mr. Bodenham argued that the object of getting the adjudication was to distribute the debtor's effects equally amongst the creditors, and, therefore, no hardship whatever could be inflicted on Mr. McDougall or on any other creditor. He was prepared to prove the act of Bankruptcy, and that all the preliminaries had been complied with, and therefore the Court must adjudge the debtor a bankrupt.

Mr. SMITH said he could not go so far as Mr. Bodenham did. It was not clear to him whether or not Mr. Garrold had or had not the right he claimed to appear, and he heard in opposition to the adjudication; but, nevertheless Mr. McDougall might have legal rights, which he was fully entitled to enforce, and it would not be fair that by any juggle between a debtor and particular creditors, a creditor who had legal rights should be prevented from enforcing them by not being allowed to appear on the hearing of the petition.

Mr. Garrold: That is the position I take, your Honour. I do not say there has been a "juggle" in this case, but there is nevertheless something unusual about it, as the solicitor for the petitioning creditors is really the solicitor for the debt.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Bodenham, will you concede the right this time?

Mr. Bodenham: Certainly not, your Honour.

Mr. Garrold: There is no need for concession, your Honour. Mr. Bodenham cannot show that I am prevented on legal grounds, and I certainly am not prevented on equitable grounds. Why, if the act of Bankruptcy be good and the petitioning creditors have sufficient grounds to satisfy the court, that the debtor must under the Act be made a bankrupt, what objection can there be to my appearing? If their grounds be good ones my appearing cannot make them bad; and Mr. Bodenham would have nothing to complain of. But if I could show that the peti-

tioning creditors were attempting to obtain an adjudication when they had no right to do so I should be simply doing service to the Court and also to my client.

Mr. SMITH, after considering the point, said he should hold—and it was to be distinctly understood—first, that any creditor had a right to oppose an adjudication; and, secondly, that such opposition must be subject to notice of intention to oppose having been given to the petitioning creditors. In this case, therefore, Mr. Garrold would be allowed to appear on behalf of Mr. McDougall, but notice, supported by affidavit, must be given; and to enable that to be done he should adjourn the hearing until the 7th November, when the Registrar would take it under the delegated powers.

Mr. Garrold objected to the requirement of the notice, it not being directed in the rules, but the judge held that it must be given.

## APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS JOSEPH BRADSHAW, barrister-at-law, has been appointed by the Lord Chancellor to be Judge of the Northumberland County Courts (Circuit No. 1), in succession to Mr. D. R. Blaine, who has been transferred to circuit No. 43 (Marylebone, Brompton, and Brentford). Mr. Bradshaw is the eldest son of the late J. H. Bradshaw, Esq. (who died in 1845), by Catherine, daughter of Richard Stuart, Esq., and was born in the year 1824. He was educated at Eton and at Christ Church, Oxford, but did not take a degree. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in November, 1853, and practised for some years as an equity draughtsman and conveyancer. He held a commission as captain in the 2nd regiment of Lancashire militia from 1851 to 1856. On the formation of the Judicature Commission in 1867, he was appointed secretary. He married, in 1847, the Hon. Frances Catherine, only daughter of Henry, 14th Viscount Hereford, formerly a maid of honour to the Queen. Circuit No. 1 embraces Gateshead, Alnwick, Belford, Bellingham, Berwick, Hexham, Morpeth, Newcastle-on-Tyne, North Shields, Rothbury, and Wooler.

Mr. THOMAS DAVID SMITH, solicitor, of Alnwick, has been elected Coroner for the Northern Division of the County of Northumberland, in succession to Mr. J. J. Hardy, deceased. Mr. Smith was admitted in 1856, and had for some years been deputy-coroner, under the late Mr. Hardy, for North Northumberland. The other candidate for the coronership on this occasion was Dr. Symonds, a medical practitioner of Newcastle.

Mr. WILLIAM CHARLES WARD, solicitor, of Durham, has been appointed Deputy Prothonotary of the Court of Pleas of that city, which office was rendered vacant by the death of his father, the late Mr. Alderman John Ward, Mayor of Durham. Mr. W. C. Ward was educated at Bishop Cosin's Hall, in the University of Durham, and graduated B.A. at the University in 1857. He was admitted in 1864, and (as we announced last week) has been appointed to succeed his father as Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for Durham.

Mr. CHARLES JEFFREY, of the Northern Circuit, has been appointed district magistrates in Jamaica, the salary being £800 per annum. Mr. Jeffrey was called to the bar in June, 1865.

## GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

### FEES OF PERPETUAL COMMISSIONERS.

Sir,—The point raised by your correspondents "Two Perpetual Commissioners," in your issue of October the 14th is an important one. Surely the commissioners would be entitled to an extra payment for the duplicate, and a *fortiori* to the same in the case of the two deeds.

October 28.

E. C.

Sir,—On this subject, which is one of some importance to all solicitors, whether concerned as themselves commissioners, or as having to settle with those who are, some correspondents of yours ask two questions in a recent number of the *Solicitors' Journal*. They ask first, what are the proper fees payable to the Perpetual Commissioners where a conveyance is executed and acknowledged in duplicate by two married women, both interested in the same property.

And, second, they ask—what are the proper fees in the same case, supposing two deeds instead of deed and duplicate.

It seems to me that in the latter case the commissioners would be entitled to the extra fee and a half; but in the former case, I do not see how they can be entitled to anything beyond the original fee and a half. **RUSTICUS.**

[Rusticus is in our opinion right. The commissioners would in the second case be entitled to a fee and a half for each deed—i.e., three fees in all. But in the first case, we apprehend that one fee and a half would cover the proper charges, nothing extra being payable for the duplicate.—**ED. S. J.**]

#### BANKRUPTCY PROXIES.

Sir,—I read with pleasure a paragraph in your last week's issue that the Registrar of the Oldham Bankruptcy Court has refused to seal and post forms of proof of debt and proxies which had any names filled in, but had required the forms to be issued in blank, leaving the creditor to whom it was addressed to fill in what name as his proxy he chose.

I wish all the Bankruptcy Court Registrars in the country would do the same, and so get rid of the "touting" appearance the forms bear, when they are sent out with (of course) the name of the debtor's attorney and his clerk filled in them. There is no objection to filling in the name and description of the debtor either in print or writing in the heading of the form of proof, and it is in fact a convenience if done, but as before stated, any filling in of names of a proxy is objectionable, and should not be allowed.

Oct. 31.

ANTI-TOU.

#### OBITUARY.

MR. T. COLLING, J.P.

Mr. Thomas Colling, barrister-at-law, and a Justice of the Peace for the North Riding of Yorkshire, died suddenly on the 26th October, at Guisborough, while walking with his wife and some friends in the Priory Gardens, belonging to Admiral Chaloner. He was called to the bar at Gray's Inn in November, 1826, and was formerly a member of the Northern Circuit, practising also at the North Riding sessions of York. He had also for some years been a Commissioner of Bankruptcy, and on his retirement was nominated a Justice of the Peace for the North Riding. Mr. Colling was in his 70th year.

MR. W. ROBOTHAM.

Mr. William Robotham, solicitor, of Derby, died suddenly on the 27th October, while attending an auction sale at the Bell Hotel. Messrs. Ault & Smith, auctioneers of Derby, were offering for sale a large estate and mansion, known as Winsley Hall, near Driffield. The estate was knocked down for £8,300 to Mr. Robotham, who immediately afterwards spoke to a friend sitting beside him, saying, "I will just go and tell the auctioneer who the purchaser is." He was about to sign the agreement, when he suddenly fell back and died. Mr. Robotham, who was in his 72nd year, was admitted in 1837. A local paper says:—"Mr. Robotham was one of the oldest legal practitioners of Derby, and his skill and knowledge as a real property lawyer were well known to and recognised by the profession. By the painstaking, able, and conscientious discharge of his professional duties during the whole of his career, and his consistent and upright character, he had won the esteem and confidence of his numerous clients, and the general respect of his fellow-townsmen."

MR. H. R. EVANS.

Mr. Hugh Robert Evans, solicitor, of Ely, died at St. Mary's-street, Ely, on the 25th of October, in the 66th year of his age. He was admitted in 1827, and held the following appointments, which all become vacant by his death:—Clerk of the Peace for the county of Cambridge, Clerk to the Magistrates of the Ely Division, Clerk to the Dean and Chapter of Ely, Clerk to the Ely Turnpike Trusts, Clerk to the Cawdle Commissioners, Clerk to the Commissioners of the 100 Tithes, Receiver and Expenditor-General of the Bedford Level Corporation, Treasurer to the Ouse Outfall Commissioners, Registrar of the Diocese, Steward to the Bishop's, Dean's, and many other Courts, &c. Since 1864 he had been in partnership with his son, Mr. William Johnson Evans, who has officiated in the above offices during his illness.

#### SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

##### METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL LAW ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this association was held this year on October 10 and 11, in Newcastle, and was well attended. The use of the Council Chamber had been granted for the occasion. The president, Lewis Fry, Esq., Liverpool, occupied the chair. Among those present were Mr. Philip Rickman (general secretary); Mr. C. H. Stanton (local secretary), Newcastle; Mr. W. Shaen, London; Mr. H. G. Taylor, St. Helen's; Mr. R. A. Dees, Newcastle; Mr. R. A. Payne, Liverpool; Mr. Thomas Avison, Liverpool; Mr. John Monckton, Maidstone; Mr. John Cooper, Manchester; Mr. W. H. Guest, Manchester; Mr. G. J. Johnson, Birmingham; Mr. C. T. Saunders, Birmingham; Mr. A. Matthew, Birmingham; Mr. R. S. Watson, Newcastle; Mr. John Clayton, Newcastle; Mr. J. A. Rose, London; Mr. Joseph Watson, Newcastle; Mr. Frederic Beaver, Manchester; Mr. Frank Parker, London; Mr. John Brewster, Middlesbrough; Mr. John Latimer, Leeds; Mr. W. Harper; Mr. W. S. Sadgrove, London; Mr. J. Street, Manchester; Mr. W. Radcliffe, Liverpool; Mr. J. Hawdon, Selby; Mr. Francis D. Lowndes, Liverpool; Mr. I. H. E. Gill, Liverpool; Mr. A. J. Torr, London; Mr. G. F. Hill, Cardiff; Mr. H. J. Francis, London; Mr. S. Williams, London; Mr. W. Daggett, Newcastle; Mr. G. W. Hodge, Newcastle; Mr. W. H. Clarke, Bristol; Mr. J. D. Kay, Leeds; Mr. H. S. Wasbrough, Bristol; Mr. J. B. Falconar, Newcastle; Mr. M. Eiffe, London; Mr. R. Fuley, Ashford, Kent; Mr. J. Fleming, Newcastle; Mr. W. S. Daglish, Newcastle; Mr. T. G. Gibson, Newcastle; Mr. H. Dunn, Darlington; Mr. J. Bulmer, Leeds; Mr. J. Lewis, Wrexham; Mr. J. G. Youll, Newcastle; Mr. Thomas Marshall, Leeds; Mr. J. S. Torr, London; Mr. J. Holity, York; Mr. George Brown, York; Mr. W. Walker, York; Mr. C. U. Laws; Mr. A. Ryland, Birmingham; Mr. J. A. Bush, Newcastle; Mr. John Case, Maidstone.

The CHAIRMAN.—In October, 1860, now eleven years ago, the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association was received and most hospitably entertained in this great centre of industry, and I cannot better commence the proceedings of the present meeting than by congratulating our members and friends, as I do most heartily, on being again assembled under the roof (if I may so say) of tried and constant friends.

When at the last Easter Term General Meeting of the association, held, as usual, in London, I was elected to the office of provincial deputy chairman, I little thought that it would fall to my lot, as chairman of the association, to address this meeting. The sad death, however, of your late lamented chairman—Mr. Benham, of London—has called me a year sooner than I expected, to fill the position that in ordinary course he would have now occupied. The association has since sustained another and most heavy loss in the death from the upsetting of his boat of Mr. Edwin Wilkins Field, one of the founders and most active members of the association. I feel sure that you will all join with me in bearing witness to the untiring zeal he always showed in the promotion of the objects for which the association was formed, and in gratefully acknowledging the eminent services he rendered, not only to the profession but to the public at large, by the employment of his great abilities during a long and laborious career, in initiating or forwarding many important measures of law reform, especially those which have resulted in the abolition of the cumbrous and expensive practice of our courts of equity, and in procuring a suitable site for, and promoting the erection of a palace of justice worthy of this great nation. Resolutions of condolence were passed by the managing committee with reference to the sad occurrence to which I have alluded, and copies forwarded to Mrs. Benham and Mrs. Field—a course which I am confident you will cordially approve.

There has seldom of late years been a session so devoid as that lately brought to a close, of measures effecting reforms or alterations in the law having especial interest to the profession, and the labours of Parliament, though unusually arduous and protracted, have not been more fruitful in this direction than in legislation of a more general character.

The principal bills of this description which have passed into law were—

Sir R. Palmer's County Justices Qualification Amendment Bill.

The Attorney-General's Judicial Committee of Privy Council Bill.

The Attorney-General's Juries Act (1870) Amendment Bill.

Mr. Sheridan's Lodgers' Goods Protection Bill.

Mr. Stanfield's Stamp Act (1870) Amendment Bill.

The Statute Law Revision Bill.

And Mr. Stephen Cave's Trust Funds Investment Bill.

A statement of the general effect of each of these Acts will be found in the pamphlet, "Legislative Results of the Session," which will be shortly sent as usual to each member of the association. I therefore do not enter further into them now, though I cannot refrain from congratulating our own branch of the profession upon the removal of the slur which was felt to rest upon it whilst the practising solicitor was by statute made incapable of being a county justice of the peace. This statutory incapacity has been removed by Sir R. Palmer's Act, with the limitation that a solicitor is not permitted to fill the office of magistrate in the county within which he carries on practice.

Another disqualification, affecting or supposed to affect both branches of the profession alike, has also been removed by one of the Acts of Parliament I have named, and though, from its obsolete character, its abolition can scarcely be made the subject of serious congratulation, I may be allowed to refer to it as illustrative of the difficulty and doubt to which, notwithstanding recent attempts towards revision and modification, our statute law may still give rise. I allude to the startling assertion recently made in the House of Commons that an Act of Parliament passed in the 46th year of Edward III., and in the year of grace, 1372, was still in force prohibiting all practising members of the legal profession from sitting in Parliament as representatives of county constituencies, and inasmuch as at the present moment no less than six barristers and two members of our own branch of the profession (one in England and one in Ireland) enjoy this honour, the statement was naturally received with surprise and incredulity. Upon reference to the first volume of the revised edition of the Statutes, published in 1870, under the authority of the House of Lords, the Act in question is to be found occupying with its translation, nearly an entire page of the work. After reciting that "men of law who follow divers businesses in the King's Courts on behalf of private persons with whom they are to procure, or cause to be brought into Parliament many petitions in the name of the commons which in no wise relate to them, but only the private persons with whom they are engaged"; it is enacted that "hereafter no man of law following business in the King's Court be returned nor accepted knight of the shire." It appears to be very doubtful whether the statute in question ever possessed the authority of an Act of Parliament, and whether it was more than a mere ordinance of the King or of the House of Lords, and it was treated by the Attorney-General as not being part of the law of the land; but there was sufficient uncertainty on the point to induce him to promise that its repeal should be included in the Statute Law Revision Bill of the present year, which has I presume, been done. But the remarkable point in this curious episode, is, that the Act in question had not been included in any of the Repealing Statutes, passed with the object of clearing the statute book of obsolete legislation. The first of these Acts, the Statute Law Revision Act of 1863, while it repeals several Acts of the same reign, strangely enough makes no mention of the one in question, and it thus made its formal appearance in the volume of Revised Statutes issued in 1870. Not many weeks later in the session, the accuracy of the Revised Statutes was again brought into question. It will be in the remembrance of many of those whom I address, that in one of the many debates upon the Army Regulation Bills, the Solicitor-General referred, in support of the doctrine that the power of regulating the army rests solely with the Crown, to an Act of Parliament of the 12th year of King Charles II, which he asserted stood still unrepealed in the statute book. This Act however does not appear in the Revised Statutes at all. It seems that the Act was repealed by the Revision Act of 1863, except only a part of the preamble which declared the sole right of the militia to be in the King, and which was expressly left unrepealed as embodying an important constitutional doctrine. But remarkable as it seems to leave the preamble of an Act of Parliament in existence without any enacting clauses—wandering, a shade without a body, in the limbo of the statute law—it is still more surprising that an enact-

ment, considered of sufficient importance to be made the subject of such careful preservation should be omitted from the authorised revision to which we have been told, by a very high authority, that we may look as a faithful record of our statute law. Surely the fact that within a few weeks the law officers of the Crown declared an Act, which appears in the Revised Statutes not to be part of the law of the land, and another Act to be part of that law, which is not found there at all seems to indicate a grievous want of unity in the proceedings of those to whom the great work of revision is entrusted, and to point, as do so many other matters which constantly come before the notice of the practising lawyer, to the necessity of our having a minister of justice who shall be responsible to Parliament and to the country for the form in which bills sanctioned by the Legislature pass into the Statute Book.

The following law bills of last session were either thrown out or withdrawn:—

Lord Cairns' Bill to consolidate and amend the law as to justices procedure out of quarter sessions.

Mr. Norwood's County Courts Jurisdiction and Procedure Bill, to give to the county courts full jurisdiction in all cases subject to removal by *certiorari*.

Mr. Baxter's Court of Chancery Funds Bill to transfer the Suits' Fund to the Consolidated Fund.

The bills relating to the game laws abolition or amendment.

Mr. D. Dalrymple's Habitual Drunkards' Bill, to permit the confinement of such persons as lunatics.

Mr. Charley's Infant Life Protection Bill for regulating the system of placing young children out to nurse.

Mr. Winterbotham's Bill to amend the Lunacy Regulation Acts by enabling the Lord Chancellor to appoint guardians to persons of weak mind.

Sir G. Jenkinson's Murder Law Amendment and Appeal Bill, to confine the punishment of death to cases defined as murder of the first degree, and making provisions for new trials in all cases of murder.

Mr. Hinde Palmer's Patents for Inventions Bill to establish a machinery for inquiry into alleged inventions and the granting of indefeasible patents.

Mr. Russell Gurney's Bill for the establishment of public prosecutors.

Mr. George Gregory's Bill for discontinuing the registration of deeds, &c., in Middlesex.

Mr. George Gregory's Real Estate (Title and Conveyance) Bill proposing to establish a registration of short titles.

Mr. Norwood's Bill for the registration of all partnerships not being incorporated or registered under the Companies Act, 1862.

The committee have had much correspondence as to many of these bills with the provincial law societies and others, and especially with Mr. Stone, of Leicester; Mr. Munby, of York; Mr. Field, of Leamington; and Mr. J. Lewis, of Wrexham, and others of the managing committee, who are town clerks or clerks to justices, as to the Justices Procedure Bill. Some very important suggestions for the amendment of the bill were in consequence made by the committee, and Mr. Oke, the able chief clerk at the Mansion-house, who has the charge of the bill out of doors, has promised to introduce those amendments into it previous to its re-appearance in Parliament.

The subject of professional remuneration has continued to excite much attention since our last provincial meeting, and there appears to be a general recognition of the importance of introducing a change into the existing system, and of enabling the practising solicitor to relieve himself as far as possible from the irksome labour involved in the preparation of detailed bills of costs. You will be aware from the last annual report that a numerous sub-committee had attended several conferences on this subject, with a special committee of the council of the Incorporated Law Society, and that the result of these conferences was the recommendation and extensive circulation by the council of the Incorporated Law Society of a scale of charges by commission for conveyancing business.

The managing committee, though approving generally of this scale, refrained from giving any formal sanction to it as they had not received information respecting the views of several of the large provincial law societies. The managing committee have since received another scale of charges by commission, recommended by the Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and Wor-



chester Law Societies, and on receipt of this scale they at once referred it to the sub-committee, with the object of ascertaining in what way the different views of the profession might be reconciled, and wrote requesting to be favoured with the views of the council of the Incorporated Law Society. The council replied "That as the whole subject had been so fully and recently considered by the council in consultation with a committee of your association, they think it would be undesirable that the matter should be reopened at present." A letter was subsequently received by Mr. Jevons, the honorary secretary of a meeting of delegates from provincial law societies held at Liverpool on the 5th of July, requesting to know if the committee would agree to a conference proposed by such meeting of delegates with a view to the adoption, if practicable, in the metropolis and the provinces, of a uniform scale of charges by commission. Upon this, the managing committee referred the whole matter to the sub-committee with full powers and an instruction to attend any such conference that might be held in London. But no further steps have yet been taken.

It would be out of place to attempt in such an address as this to enter into the details of the respective proposals. I may state that the council of the Bristol Law Society has given a general approval to the scale proposed by the council of the Incorporated Law Society, and has recommended such scale to its members.

It is obvious that the whole matter is one upon which a satisfactory conclusion can be reached only after much consideration and discussion, and that the introduction of the system of commission must be a gradual work. I believe that both the scales I have referred to are valuable as tentative measures, and I have little doubt that experience will prove the convenience and advantage of the system both to clients and to solicitors, and that a general and uniform practice may ultimately be arrived at.

The important subject of legal education has been brought prominently before the public since our last meeting, by the introduction of a motion relating to it by Sir Roundell Palmer into the House of Commons. This motion affirmed that "it is desirable that a general school of law should be established in the metropolis, in the government of which the different branches of the legal profession in England may be suitably represented, and that after the establishment thereof, no person should be admitted to practice any branch of the legal profession either at or below the bar, or as an attorney or solicitor in England, without a certificate of proficiency in the study of law, granted after proper examination by such general school of law." The motion produced much difference of opinion in the House, and was vigorously opposed by an eminent member of the Chancery Bar, Mr. Jessel, who defended the present system as adequate to the wants and suitable to the ideas and habits of the people of England, and objected to the proposed school of law as an attempt to create a monopoly of legal education, and of the right to grant an entrance to the profession. After the debate had been twice adjourned, the motion was withdrawn amid the pressure of the latter part of the session, and no definite result has therefore been yet attained by those who adopt the programme of the Legal Education Association. The subject will no doubt be renewed next year, but with so great a divergence of opinion as appears to exist amongst lawyers, it may be doubtful whether the public will feel sufficient interest in the subject to bring about immediately a change in the present system. I cannot but believe, however, that by the discussion of this question some points of importance will be clearly established—that there will before long be a general agreement with Sir R. Palmer's opinion, that the legal education of the country cannot be considered to be in a satisfactory state, that it is still to a large extent unsystematic, "unscientific, desultory and empirical," and that the want of "a broad and scientific foundation is felt in our crude and undigested legislation, which as yet shows no tendency to amendment." Every one, I believe, will admit that the condition of things which still exists as regards some of the Inns of Court under which students can gain admission to the bar without passing any test of legal acquirement, is indefensible, and that the Inns of Court and of Chancery cannot be regarded as doing as much for the promotion of legal education as their importance and their wealth entitle the country to expect. And, as regards the relations between the two branches of the profession, I cannot but think that the almost impassable barrier which the prejudice arising from

a state of things, now happily passed away, has thrown between the bar and the solicitors ought to be removed, or at least altered. I do not for a moment advocate the fusion of the two branches. I accept the opinion that the interests of our clients and the high and independent position of the bar (so important to the welfare of the State) will be best promoted by that division of the forensic duty of the advocate from the preparatory labour of the solicitor, which, at present, finds place amongst us, but I hold that the passage from either branch of the profession to the other should be made as free as possible. The barrister who may have acquired a vast amount of legal knowledge, and who, finding by experience that he has little prospect of success in the difficult career he has adopted, may be anxious to follow in the humbler path in which we walk, has I think a right to ask that his learning should not be treated as absolutely valueless, and has a just ground of complaint that he is compelled to undergo as long a term of service as an articled clerk—as if he were standing at the first round of the legal ladder. And why should not the solicitor who may be conscious of ability and inclination for a forensic career, be allowed credit for his legal knowledge and experience, and be permitted, on passing a proper examination, to become a member of the bar, instead of being required, as at present, not only to go over the entire preparatory course prescribed by the Inns of Court, but to pass between being removed from the roll and commencing the first steps, of preparation for the bar, through a period of some years during which the stigma affixed to the attorney may be supposed to be erased? Let me not be understood to advocate an absolutely identical course of training for both branches of the profession. I believe that whilst there is much that may and ought to be common to both, it is essential in the case of the future solicitor more particularly, that the student should acquire a knowledge of, and be examined in, those special matters of practice of which the interests of his clients require that he should be master; but I contend that it is of high importance to society that every man should have the greatest facility of entering any walk of life for which he conceives himself suitable, subject to the one condition that he can prove his fitness for its pursuit. Your committee have not been inactive in dealing with the important subject to which I am now referring and have given to it much consideration. They prepared a petition to the House of Commons in support generally of Sir R. Palmer's motion, which that hon. gentleman presented to the House. This petition, after supporting the establishment of a school of law, alleged "That it is desirable that the passing of suitable examinations in such school of law should be made indispensable to the admission of students to the practice of the bar, or to practice as special pleaders, certificated conveyancers, attorneys or solicitors, and that all the several branches of legal study should be open to all who may become students without distinction or classification, leaving them to determine with which branch of the profession they will ultimately connect themselves. That the passing of these examinations should not interfere with, or lessen the necessity of such training in the practice of the respective branches of the profession, as may be deemed necessary before students are admitted to either branch, and that in the constitution of the governing body of such school of law no preponderance should be given to the bar, or to attorneys and solicitors." The committee have obtained the publication of this petition in the *Law Times* (p. 219) and *Solicitors' Journal* (p. 700), and they trust that the steps they have taken may meet with your approval.

The committee have been consulted by the Preston Law Society as to the insertion in conditions of sale of a stipulation that the conveyance shall be prepared by the vendor's solicitor and at the purchaser's expense, and have reiterated to them the opinion they came to many years ago of the great impropriety of any such course.

I have now adverted to some of the principal matters which have come before the committee during the past year, and I feel that I have need to ask indulgence for the somewhat hasty and uninteresting manner in which I have dealt with them. But I may be allowed to allege in excuse for any shortcomings that I have been so unexpectedly called to fill the chair of the association, that I have been unable to attend, except on rare occasions, the deliberations of the managing committee, and that, in consequence of absence from England during the last few weeks, I have been prevented from giving much time to the preparation of this address.

At the last meeting of the committee, previous to the present long vacation, letters from numerous London members of the association were laid before them recommending an entertainment being given in London next year to the provincial members. On reading these letters the committee resolved that at this general meeting the chairman should (as I accordingly now do) invite the association to hold its next autumn general meeting in London. I will add on this head that the committee have communicated on the subject with the council of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, who have written in answer that if it be arranged that a meeting of this association shall be held in the metropolis they will do all in their power to make the visit of members from the provinces as agreeable as possible. It remains, therefore, for this meeting to decide (after hearing any invitations that may be offered from other localities) where our autumn general meeting of 1872 shall be held.

In conclusion, let me say a few words in advocacy of the claim of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association to more extended support. Our branch of the profession is, I think, a little deficient in that professional spirit—that *esprit de corps*—which should lead us to turn occasionally from our individual avocations to the consideration of our interests as a body, and of those subjects which we should pursue in common for the public good. Associations like this fill a most important office in encouraging such a spirit; and let it not be supposed that this more enlarged conception of our duties as a profession conflicts with our true interests as individuals. The two are identical. Men have, I think, followed a true instinct in according to the members of professions a somewhat higher social position than to those who are devoted to trade. The merchant necessarily keeps before his mind immediately and constantly the consideration of his own private loss or gain in every transaction of business—the lawyer (like the physician) ought, in the true discharge of his duties, to set before himself a different and higher object—the assistance and protection of another, the interest of the client whose cause he has undertaken or whose rights he is employed to secure. Or to take a perhaps still truer view of our especial calling, we may consider ourselves as ministers of the law, and as essential parts of the great machinery by which justice (the divinest element of human institutions) may be secured to every man. Let us seek to cultivate this high sense of our duty, convinced that such sentiments as these are not empty phrases, but constitute a sober standard of action to which every one of us may reach, and that, aiming at this standard, we shall not only receive the reward of our own consciences, but that society will not refuse to us, that to which we are more and more making good our claim, our recognition as an honourable and liberal profession.

Mr. WM. SHAEN, of London, moved, and Mr. STEPHEN WILLIAMS, of London, seconded, that the next autumnal meeting of the association be held in London.

Mr. G. J. JOHNSON, of Birmingham, moved that the meeting be held in that town, but subsequently withdrew his amendment, and the invitation of London was accepted unanimously.

Mr. J. H. E. GILL, Liverpool, proposed a vote of thanks to the president for his address, and suggested the amalgamation of the Incorporated Law Society and the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association.

The Sheriff of NEWCASTLE (Wm. Daggett, Esq.) seconded the motion, and said he could not see why there should be two centres in London, and several societies in different parts of Great Britain, each independent of the other, but all having the same object. He thought the time had arrived when they should unite.

Mr. TORR thought it would not be sufficient to refer the matter to the committee: they should have a full discussion of it. Nearly all their disadvantages were owing to their not having a centre of organisation.

Mr. LOWNDEN complained that the solicitorships to public departments were almost entirely given to the bar, one member of which had recently obtained the office of Solicitor to the Treasury, which had hitherto been the one prize open to the lower branch of the profession.

Mr. SHAEN said the subject of the organization of the profession was most important; but they had the machinery in the present societies if they would only use it.

The resolution was carried by acclamation.

Mr. GILL, to test the feeling on the subject just mooted, proposed that, "having regard to the important questions

now affecting the profession, it is desirable that there should be a more complete organization of it, having one centre in London and another in the Provinces; and that it be referred to the committee to see whether this desirable object cannot be effected by uniting the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association with the various incorporated law societies throughout the kingdom."

A long discussion ensued, and Mr. DENN, Newcastle, seconded the resolution.

Mr. CLAYTON expressed an opinion that the co-existence of the two societies was very desirable for the interests of the profession generally.

Ultimately, the motion was put into the following shape, and unanimously agreed to:—"That the managing committee be requested to consider whether by any means the organization of the profession can be made more effective."

Mr. G. J. JOHNSON, of Birmingham, read a paper "On some of the objections to the proposed scheme of legal education."—Mr. GILL read a paper by Mr. JEVONS, of Liverpool, "On legal education."

A long and animated debate ensued, the speakers being Mr. TORR, Mr. SHAEN, Mr. TAYLOR, of St. Helen's; Mr. RYLAND, Birmingham; Mr. FURLEY, Mr. SAUNDERS, Birmingham; Mr. J. A. ROSE, London; Mr. R. S. WATSON, Newcastle; and Mr. LOWNDEN.

It is proposed to found a new school or university for the special study of law, and with power to grant degrees. A great diversity of opinion was expressed; and Mr. SHAEN, on the part of the University of London, threatened an opposition on the matter of granting degrees. The association had petitioned Parliament in favour of the objects advocated in the papers.—No resolution was passed, and the members adjourned at five o'clock. They were entertained to dinner in the evening at the Queen's Head Hotel, Pilgrim-street, by the members of the Newcastle Law Society.

#### SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. J. COOPER, of Manchester, read a paper on "The Two Scales of Professional Remuneration by Commission."

A long discussion ensued; and the following resolution, moved by Mr. SHAEN, and seconded by Mr. RYLAND, was agreed to:—"That the Managing Committee of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association communicate the paper of Mr. COOPER, of Manchester, to all the provincial law societies, with a request to be favoured with their views upon it; and that the managing committee communicate such views to the Council of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, with a request that the council will confer with the managing committee with a view to the adoption of uniform scales of charges by commission, or otherwise by the entire profession, and the sanction of such scales by legislation or rules and orders."

Mr. PAYNE, Liverpool, read a paper by Mr. R. B. LOWNDEN, of London, on "The system of taxing costs as between party and party." The paper pointed out that the present system of taxing costs in contested cases, throwing on the successful party the payment of a great portion of the necessary charges which his attorney reasonably and properly makes against him, works very great injustice to the suitor, and which ought to be remedied. The present system of taxation of costs as between party and party is irrational and indefensible, and the wide difference between taxation, as between attorney and client and as between party and party, might be, and ought to be, very materially diminished. It is most probable that before the next annual meeting new rules and orders, with new scales of costs, would be drawn up, and have received the sanction and authority of the Legislature. The attorney for the successful party ought to be allowed on taxation between party and party for whatever he had had necessarily to do, possibly, for whatever he had reasonably done to prosecute or defend his action. In other words, having reference to the nature of the case, all expenses necessarily incurred by a litigant party, should be recompensed to him if he succeeds. Less injustice would be done than at present by the Master premising that all work charged for had been necessarily and properly done, unless the other side proved to the contrary. He thought it not an unreasonable thing to ask that it might be presumed that a bill of costs submitted for taxation fairly represents the work done, and includes nothing that had not been done; but if any further safeguard were asked for, the attorney (not the agent, in agency cases) might make an affidavit that the bill of costs submitted for taxation was a

just and true one, and to the best of his ability contains no improper charges. Judicious reform in this respect will tend to prevent commercial immorality by giving a debtor less inducement to dispute, and more cogent reasons for speedily paying his debts, and will in a very vast degree tend to increase the reputation and prosperity of the honourable profession to which the reader belonged.

Mr. SAUNDERS, Birmingham, read a paper on "A dip into a Blue-book," giving the cost of the different courts of law and justice in the three kingdoms. The author said that the fusion of the two great divisions of our judicial system, common law and equity, and the consolidation of our various courts into one high court of justice, with the consequent concentration of the now numerous and costly separate offices and staffs would, as a question of national expenditure alone, be productive of an immense saving to the country. The reforms he advocated would necessitate local courts of first instance which might, though he thought it would not, entail upon the country greater national judicial expenditure than our present complicated, cumbrous, and diffuse machinery; but there would be a saving to the individual suitor, and this would be only one of the many advantages which would result.

Mr. ROSE objected to the paper *in toto*.

Mr. MATTHEWS, in reference to the taxing masters, was satisfied with the way they did their work, and thought £1,500 a year not too much.

The PRESIDENT said they were very much indebted to Mr. Saunders for his paper.

Mr. H. E. GILL, Liverpool, read a paper on "The Law of Bankruptcy." It specified some of the difficulties in the legal working of the Act, and stated that, although dealing with only one branch of the subject, it was by no means the most faulty.

Mr. TORR said the paper was a most able treatise on the subject, and ought to be sent to the Lord Chancellor, the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, and the framers of the bill. It formed an additional reason for urging upon the Government the necessity of employing competent persons to draw bills; at present it was in a most unsatisfactory state.

Mr. ROSE said there were enormous difficulties in the way of getting Acts of Parliament settled in order to be homogeneous. He had listened to the paper with the greatest possible attention, and, a more laborious and useful paper never was submitted to the association.

Mr. SHAWN said the present mode of preparing bills was an absolute disgrace to us as a nation: it was not only that the wrong people were constantly employed, but when the right men were employed, the mode in which they received their instructions was as absurd as it could be. He mentioned details connected with our circumlocution office, which he said ought to be generally known. What we wanted was a branch of the Ministry of Justice which should be a great public office, responsible to the public, and where they might know the condition of every bill brought before Parliament.

The SECRETARY, with reference to knowing the state of bills, said that this year, for the first time, the House of Commons had issued with its votes every Monday a list of all the public bills and the stages they were in on that Monday, beyond that they must watch the votes.

Mr. LOWNDES bore testimony to the most unsatisfactory manner of drafting Government bills. They wanted a department such as Mr. Sharn suggested, but with attorneys upon it. The paper was a very valuable one; and it was at present a dreadful puzzle to have anything to do with bankruptcy.

Mr. MARSHALL, Leeds, thought the Bankruptcy Bill was well drawn, and that the Act was by no means the disgrace it was considered. The rules and orders were not a discreditable performance: looking to the haste in which they were produced, they were exceedingly creditable. He hoped some means would be devised by which this terrible conflict upon elementary propositions of law may be avoided, and paid his tribute to the exceeding value of the paper.

Mr. MONCKTON spoke in defence of the draughtsmen.

The PRESIDENT said the discussion only showed the necessity of the responsible minister proposed.

Mr. DRES, Newcastle, characterised the Act as a wretched one, and said that the rules and orders were disgraceful.

Mr. RYLAND proposed a vote of thanks to Sir R. Palmer for his very valuable services connected with legal educa-

tion. After the meeting at Leeds, at which the movement originated, they went to Sir R. Palmer, who received them with the greatest courtesy and with very great encouragement, and from that time he had given the most undeviating attention to this very important subject. Sir Roundell had accepted the office of Chairman of the Legal Education Association, and had advocated in the most able and eloquent manner the claims which the solicitors and the bar put forward for a law university or school of law.

Mr. SHAWN had great pleasure in seconding the motion, and it was carried unanimously.

The PRESIDENT congratulated the association upon the success which had attended the present meeting. (Applause.) They had been favoured with a number of papers of very great interest; and the discussions had been of unusual interest and spirit. The success of the meeting was due in a very large measure to the efforts of their friends at Newcastle. If they had not had the experience of their former visit, they would, from the position Newcastle holds, have formed high expectations of the manner in which they would be entertained here; and he could not but think that, however high might have been their expectations, none of them would have been disappointed. They had been received in a manner in every way worthy of the high position which Newcastle holds. All the arrangements for their reception had been of the most agreeable and complete character; the arrangements for the meetings had been altogether such as they could desire; and he need hardly allude to the very magnificent entertainment of the previous night. For all this their thanks were due to the Law Society of this town; and he had very great pleasure in moving a vote of thanks to that society for the very magnificent hospitality with which the members from a distance had been received.

Mr. STEPHEN WILLIAMS seconded the resolution, and it was carried by acclamation.

The Sheriff of NEWCASTLE, and President of the Law Society of Newcastle (W. Daggett, Esq.) responded, and said it was a great gratification to have had the association amongst them in Newcastle.

Mr. COOPER said that, although they had expressed their thanks to the Newcastle Law Society as a body, yet there was one member of it to whom he thought it was their duty to express their thanks; and there had been put into his hands a resolution which commended itself very much to his own feelings, and he would not have preferred to have any other entrusted to him. It was "That the best thanks of this meeting be given to Mr. C. H. Stanton—(loud cheers)—for his great and successful exertions to promote the business and entertainment of the meeting." (Applause.) He could only repeat the observations of the president. It had been his fortune and happiness to be associated with Mr. Stanton in matters upon which discussion had arisen at that meeting, and he had had the opportunity of observing that energy and ability which Mr. Stanton possesses, and that devotion to all matters which affect the benefit of the profession; and that energy, ability, and devotion had been put forward by Mr. Stanton in his preparations for that meeting. (Applause.)

Mr. TORR had great pleasure in seconding the proposition. In common with all the visitors, he had experienced the very genial and cordial hospitality which Mr. Stanton knows so well how to show, and which had enhanced very much the pleasure of their visit.

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

Mr. STANTON, in responding, said he had been greatly assisted by a most able committee; and if the arrangements had in any way contributed to their comfort he was amply repaid.

Mr. ROSE moved, and Mr. LOWNDES seconded, a vote of thanks to the Mayor and Corporation for the use of the Council Chamber; and the SHERIFF responded.

A vote of thanks was also given to the authors of the papers.

The Sheriff of Newcastle moved a vote of thanks to the president for his very able address, and for his able and courteous conduct in the chair.

Mr. GILL seconded the motion.—Carried by acclamation.

The PRESIDENT, in responding, said he would carry away from Newcastle very many pleasant recollections, not only of the interesting discussions they had had, but of the many acquaintanceships and friendships he had formed.

Mr. S. WILLIAMS moved, and Mr. PAYNE seconded a vote of thanks of the secretary for his zeal, assiduity, care, and devotion to the interests of the association.



The PRESIDENT bore testimony to the zeal with which the secretary discharged his duties, and to the uniform kindness and courtesy which he manifested.

The motion was carried by acclamation, and the SECRETARY responded, and said it would always be his endeavour to deserve their good opinion.

The meeting then separated.

#### SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the board of directors of this association was held at the Law Institution, London, on Wednesday last, November 1st, Mr. J. S. Torr in the chair; the other directors present being, Messrs Brook, Carter, Cookson, Hedger, Monckton, Nelson, Shaen, and Smith: (Mr. Eiffe, secretary). A sum of £115 was granted in relief of the widows and families of four deceased members of the association, and a sum of £45, was distributed in relief of four deceased non-members' families. One new life, and four new annual members were admitted to the association. A bequest in favour of the association was reported of £150, free of duty, under the will of the late Charlotte Elizabeth Walmsley, and other general business was transacted.

#### THE LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this Society, held at the Law Institution on Tuesday evening last, Mr. Hargreaves (for Mr. Sidney Woolf) in the chair, the question discussed was No. 481 legal, "Is a father who deserts his child liable in an action for necessities supplied by a third party? *Urmston v. Newcomen*, 4 A. & E. 899," which was opened by Mr. Widdows in the affirmative, and so decided by the Society.

#### COURT PAPERS.

##### COURT OF CHANCERY.

SITTINGS IN MICHAELMAS TERM, 1871.

##### LORD CHANCELLOR.

Westminster.

Thurs., Nov. 2..App. mtns. & apps  
Lincoln's Inn.  
Friday, Nov. 3..Appeals.  
Monday .... 6 } Appeals.  
Tuesday .... 7 }  
Wednesday .. 8..Ptns. and apps.  
Thursday .. 9..Appeals.  
Friday ....10..App. mtns. & apps.  
Monday ....13 }  
Tuesday ....14 } Appeals.  
Wednesday ..15 }  
Thursday ..16 }  
Friday ....17..App. mtns. & apps.  
Monday ....20 }  
Tuesday ....21 } Appeals.  
Wednesday ..22..Petitions & apps.  
Thursday ..23..Appeals.  
Friday ....24..App. mtns. & apps.

##### MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Westminster.

Thurs., Nov. 2..Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Chancery-lane.  
Friday, Nov. 3..General paper.  
Saturday .. 4 } Ptns. sht. causes,  
adj. sums, and  
general paper.  
Monday .... 6 }  
Tuesday .... 7 } General paper.  
Wednesday .. 8 }  
Thursday .. 9..Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday ....10..General paper.  
Saturday ..11 } Ptns. sht. caus.,  
adj. sums, and  
general paper.  
Monday ....13 }  
Tuesday ....14 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..15 }  
Thursday ..16..Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday ....17..General paper.  
Saturday ..18 } Ptns. sht. caus.,  
adj. sums, and  
general paper.  
Monday ....20 }  
Tuesday ....21 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..22 }  
Thursday ..23 }  
Friday ....24 } Ptns. sht. causes,  
adj. sums, and  
general paper.  
Saturday ..25..Mtns. & gen. pa.

##### LORDS JUSTICES.

Westminster.

Thurs., Nov. 2..Appeal motions.  
Lincoln's Inn.  
Friday, Nov. 3..Appeals.  
Saturday .. 4 } Ptns. in lunacy,  
appeal petitions,  
& appeals.  
Monday ....16 }  
Tuesday .... 7 } Appeals.  
Wednesday .. 8 }  
Thursday .. 9..Bkt. apps. & apps.  
Friday ....10..Appeal motions.  
Saturday ..11 } Ptns. in lunacy,  
app. ptns., &  
appeals.  
Monday ....13..Appeals.  
Tuesday ....14 } Apps. from the  
County Palatine of  
Lancaster, Apps.  
from the Stannar-  
ies Court, & apps.  
Wednesday ..15..Appeals.  
Thursday ..16..Bkt. apps. & apps.  
Friday ....17..Appeal motions.  
Saturday ..18 } Ptns. in lunacy,  
appeal petitions, &  
appeals.  
Monday ....20 }  
Tuesday ....21 } Appeals.  
Wednesday ..22 }  
Thursday ..23..Bkt. apps. & apps.  
Friday ....24..Appeal motions.  
Saturday ..25 } Ptns. in lunacy,  
app. petitions, &  
appeals.

##### V. C. Sir RICHARD MALINS.

Westminster.

Thurs., Nov. 2..Motions.  
Lincoln's Inn.  
Friday, Nov. 3..Ptns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday .. 4 } Sht. causes, adj.  
sums, & gen. pa.  
Monday .... 6 }  
Tuesday .... 7 } General paper.  
Wednesday .. 8 }  
Thursday .. 9..Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday ....10..Ptns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday ..11 } Sht. causes, ad  
sums, & gen. pa.  
Monday ....13 }  
Tuesday ....14 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..15 }

Thursday ..16..Mtns. & gen. papr.  
Friday ....17..Ptns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday ..18 } Sht. causes, adj.  
sums, & gen. pa.  
Monday ....20 }  
Tuesday ....21 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..22 }  
Thursday ..23 }

Ptns., sht. caus.  
Friday ....24 } adj. sums, and  
general paper.  
Saturday ..25..Mtns. & gen. pa.

##### V. C. Sir JAMES BACON.

Westminster.

Thurs., Nov. 2..Motions.  
Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Nov. 3..General paper.  
Saturday .. 4 } Ptns. Sht. caus.,  
& general paper.  
Monday .... 6..In Bankruptcy.  
Tuesday .... 7 } General paper.  
Wednesday .. 8 }  
Thursday .. 9..Mtns. & adj. sums.  
Friday ....10..General paper.  
Saturday ..11 } Ptns. sht. caus.,  
& general paper.  
Monday ....13..In Bankruptcy.  
Tuesday ....14 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..15 }  
Thursday ..16..Mtns. & adj. sums.  
Friday ....17..General paper.  
Saturday ..18 } Ptns. sht. caus.,  
& general paper.  
Monday ....20..In Bankruptcy.

Tuesday ....21 }  
Wednesday ..22 } General paper.  
Thursday ..23 }  
Friday ....24 } Ptns., sht. caus.,  
& general paper.  
Saturday ..25..Mtns. & adj. sums.

##### V. C. Sir JOHN WICKENS.

Westminster.

Thurs., Nov. 2..Motions.

Lincoln's Inn.

Friday, Nov. 3..Ptns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday .. 4 } Short causes and  
general paper.  
Monday .... 6 }  
Tuesday .... 7 } General paper.  
Wednesday .. 8 }  
Thursday .. 9..Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday ....10..Ptns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday ..11 } Short causes and  
general paper.  
Monday ....13 }  
Tuesday ....14 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..15 }  
Thursday ..16..Mtns. & gen. pa.  
Friday ....17..Ptns. & gen. pa.  
Saturday ..18 } Short causes, and  
general paper.  
Monday ....20 }  
Tuesday ....21 } General paper.  
Wednesday ..22 }  
Thursday ..23 } Ptns., sht. caus.,  
& general paper.  
Friday ....24 }  
Saturday ..25..Motions & gen. pa.

At the Rolls, unopposed petitions must be presented and copies left with the Secretary, on or before the Thursday preceding the Saturday on which it is intended they should be heard; and any causes intended to be heard as short causes must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard. The days (if any) on which the Lords Justices shall be engaged in the Full Court or at the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, are excepted.

Any causes intended to be heard as short causes before either of the Vice-Chancellors must be so marked at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard.

In Vice-Chancellor Wickens' Court no cause, motion for decree, or further consideration, except by order of the Court, may be marked to stand over if it be within twelve of the last cause or matter in the printed paper of the day for hearing.

##### COURT OF CHANCERY.

##### CAUSE LIST.

Michaelmas Term, 1871.

Before the LORD CHANCELLOR and the LORDS JUSTICES.

##### Appeals.

1871.  
Peter v Nicolls (S.—March 3)  
Boyd v Petrie (R.—March 6)  
Pilcher v Rawlins, appeal of  
defendant George Lamb (R.  
—March 17)  
Wright v Pitt (M.—March  
13)  
Ellis v Barker (R.—July  
14)  
Sollory v Leaver (M.—July  
22)  
Dixon v Lamare (R.—July  
25)  
Glegg v Rees (R.—July 26)  
Thompson v Thomas (S.—  
July 28)  
Patch v Rolt (R.—Aug 1)  
The Oriental Financial Cor-  
poration, limited v Overend,  
Gurney & Co., limited (M.—  
Aug 3)  
Upmann v Elkan (R.—Aug 8)  
Allones v Elkan (R.—Aug 8)  
Mc Ilwraith v The Dublin  
Trunk Connecting Railway  
Co. (R.—Aug 9)  
Calisher v Forbes (R.—Aug  
9)  
Hensman v Pearse (M.—Aug  
12)  
Dent v Ottoman Railway Co.,  
Fraser v Ottoman Railway  
Co. (appl. of William Dent  
& F. Pava (M.—Aug 25)  
Vives v Ottoman Ry. Co. appl  
of plt (M.—Aug 29)  
Dent v Ottoman Ry. Co.  
Fraser v Ottoman Ry. Co.  
appl of deft Vives (M.—Aug  
29)

Chabard v The New Russia Co., limited (R.—Sept 19)  
The Mayor, &c., of the City of London v Sandon (R.—Sept 29)

The Mayor, &c., of the City of London v Metropolitan Ry. Co. Metropolitan Ry. Co. v Mayor &c. of the City of London (R.—Sept 29)

Before the MASTER of THE ROLLS.

*Causes*

Walker v Walker demr of deft Margaret G. Walker  
Commissioners of Sewers of the City of London v Glassey demr of deft W. B. Glassey and others  
Same v Same demr of Attorney-General  
Same v Same demr of deft Pardoe  
Same v Same demr of defts Warner anr.  
Same v Same demr of deft T. Humphreys  
Same v Same demr of defts Heathcote & anr  
Same v Same demr of deft J. Mills  
Same v Same demr of deft J. W. Maitland  
Same v Same demr of deft Francis E. Maynard  
Lloyd v Thomas m d (wit before exam)  
Tanner v Mason m d (wit before exam)  
Jarvis v Allen, Allen v Jarvis f c & petn of plaintiff in first suit  
Deeks v Bailey c, wit (V.C.B.) (day to be fixed)  
Hay v Bates c, with wits (day to be fixed)  
Ronnie v Morris c, with wits (V.C.B.) (day to be fixed)  
Neely v Fluker c, with wits (V.C.B.) (day to be fixed)  
The Belgium Public Works Co. limited v Grant c, with wits (V.C.M.) (day to be fixed)  
Littlewood v Ownsworth m d (V.C.B.)  
Briggs v Hay m d (V.C.B.)  
Lingen v Burney m d (V.C.B.)  
Calthrop v Buckston m d (V.C.B.)  
Gatty v Pawson c, plt to be cross examd (V.C.B.) (day to be fixed)  
Wakeford v Jay c, with wits (V.C.B.) Nov 7, by order  
Shelley v Shelley c, with wits (day to be fixed)  
Vansittart v Osborne c, with wits (day to be fixed)  
Norgate v Parker m d (Nov 3) by order  
Cowden v Clitherow m d  
Cramer v Bird f c  
Skipwith v Skipwith m d  
Warton v Warton f c

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD MALINS.

*Causes, &c.*

Simpson v Ingleby dem  
Croaker v Standing dem  
Dence v Dixon c, wit (day to be fixed)  
Hemming v Maddick m d  
Nixon v Garstin f c (S. O.)  
The Landed Estates Co. (Limited) v Weeding m d (pt hd Nov. 6)  
Bruton v the Parish of St. George, Hanover-square m d  
Abbott v the Bakers and Confectioners' Tea Association (Limited) m d  
The Sheffield Improved Industrial and Provident Society (Limited) v Jarvis c  
Earl of Cork v Russell, Bart. m d

Carter v Smith sp c  
Britnell v Walton m d (re-transferred from M. R. by order)  
Finlay v Kemp c, wit (day to be fixed)  
Mather v Mather sp c  
Tooth v Mort m d  
Bailey v Rolland m d (re-transferred from M. R. by order)  
Lewis v Lewis m d  
Petersdorff v Cook m d  
Southorpe v Tipper m d  
Rodd v Pascoe sp c  
Cruikshank v Duffin m d  
Raithby v Hall c, wits (day to be fixed)  
The Official Liquidator of the Birmingham Banking Co. v Carter sp c

Deakins v Andrews m d  
Gray v Gray c, wit (day to be fixed)  
Pemberton v Neill m d  
Pemberton v Marriott m f d  
Watt v Muirhead f c & sums to vary (Nov 6, by order)  
Hill v Westmoreland c, with wits (day to be fixed)  
Allen v Morgan m d  
Thrupp v Scruton c  
Richardson v Houghton f c  
Falkner v Crutwell m d  
Mayar v Mercer m d  
Squires v Walker m d  
Walker v Beckley m d  
Chillingworth v Chillingworth m f d  
Last v Draks m d  
Hosford v Sugden m d  
Kingdon v Dean m d  
Redpath v Pettis m d  
Attwood v Brown sp c  
The North-Eastern Ry. Co. v Watson c (restored by order)  
Jackson v The North-Eastern Ry. Co. m d  
Price v Hutchinson c  
Dooner v Tolley m d (plaintiff to be cross-examined by order)  
Lean v Carrick c  
Andrews v Woodward c  
Wilson v Wilson (P.O.) m d  
Jones v Jones m d  
Wilkinson v Pocock c, wit (day to be fixed)  
Massie v Ray m d  
The Staffordshire Joint Stock Bank (Limited) v Smith sp c  
Swales v Kirk m d  
Peakman v Harrison case on appeal from the Dudley County Court  
May v Constable m d  
Dalton v Hodgson m d  
Hiles v Ager m d  
Melsome v Pinniger m d  
Quick v Quick m d  
Smith v Farrah m d  
Freebury v Freebury m d  
In re Moore's Estate, Eland v Moore f c, sums to vary  
Hayne v Harvey m d  
Hockenhull v Ray c  
Nicol v Chavasse m d  
Newbolt v Wright m d  
Vickers v McKwen c  
Greenwood v Ripley c  
Godson v Pitman c  
Cree v Foakes m d  
Little v Moore m d  
Birks v Silverwood case on appeal from The Doncaster County Court  
Grace v Dutton m d  
Champion v The Conservators of the River Thames c  
Leader v Pemberton m d  
Wray v Hunter c  
Wagstaff v Midland Ry. Co. m d  
Harman v Derby c, wit (day to be fixed)  
Smallfield v Smallfield sp c  
Swarbrick v Learoyd c, wit (day to be fixed)  
The Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England v Griffiths m d

Before the Vice-Chancellor SIR JAMES BACON.

*Causes, &c.*

Guylee v Guylee demr of deft Francis Guylee  
Ward v The Wolverhampton Waterworks Co. demr  
Sleeman v Wilson demr  
Ashby v Bernard c  
Hight v Dampier m d  
Blackley v Hall m d

The India and China Tea Company (Limited) v Teede m d  
Buchan v Buchan m d  
Richards v The North London Railway Company c  
Mackay v Douglas m d  
Lowe v Lowe m d  
Stockil v Booker m d  
Stacey v The Tottenham & Hampstead Junction Ry. Co. m d  
Bloomer v Spittle c  
Liddiard v Birdsey m d  
Taylor v Atherton m d (wits before exmr.)  
Smith v Stone m d  
Woodall v Layard sp c  
Pope v Probyn m d  
Cloak v Sands c  
Harrison v Topham m d  
Secker v Nixey m d  
Addison v Cox m d  
Leman v Saffory m d  
Young v Young c  
Murray v Hadley c  
Gilchrist v Herbert c  
Rolle v Rolle f c  
Richmond v Richmond m d  
Cohen v Watson m d  
Glassbrook v Carvell m d  
Hooper v Hooper m d  
Marchant v Davies c  
Nichols v Hill m d  
Pearson v Rose m d  
The Mexican Ry. Co., limited. v Woolton sp c  
Robey & Co.'s Perseverance Iron Works, limited, v Ollier m d  
Hanrott v Hulest c  
Willenas v Dimesdale m d  
Webster v The Borough of Halifax m d & sums  
Silverster v Moore m d  
Neville v Dunn f c  
George v Howes m d  
Oldfield v Boyce m d  
Trenchard v Simpson f c  
Cutcliffe v Goddard m d  
Goddard v Hughes m d  
King v Barkley f c  
May v Burton m d  
Hine v Hine f c  
Loyel v Freeth m d  
Morley v Brackenbury f c  
Church v Tamvaco m d  
Wilson v Brown c  
Torrance v Bolton c  
Atty v Etough sp c  
Pemberton v Watkins m d  
Lascelles v Mills M.P., m c  
Atkins v Binstead f c  
Van Gheluwe v Nerinckx f c (transferred from County Court by order)  
Bower v The Chesterfield & Brampton Ry. Co. m d  
Wright v Butlin f c  
Oakley v Wood f c  
Armstrong v Holmes f c  
Lindgren v Horne c  
Clowes v The Staffordshire Potteries Water Works Co. m d  
Tomkins v Parker m d (1870—T.—40)  
Tomkins v Parker m d (1870—T.—41)  
Bissicks v Walden m d  
Dixon v Muckleston m d

Hall v Hargreaves c, wit (day to be fixed)  
 Earle v Appleyard m d  
 Kemp v The South Eastern Ry. Co. m d  
 Carter v Earl Ducie m d  
 Palmer v Flower sp c  
 Savage v Snell sp c as amended  
 Wade-Gery v Handley m d  
 Charlton v Charlton m d  
 Bond v Milbourn m d  
 Ramsey v Hooper m d  
 The London & Paris Hotel Co. (Limited) v Mainwaring m d  
 Johnson v The Dudley & West Bromwich Banking Co. m d  
 Hayward v Penney m d  
 Ford v Foster m d  
 Hooper v Webb c, wit (day to be fixed)  
 Cadman v Cadman sp c  
 Wilson v Tucker m d  
 Anderson v Anderson m d  
 Bigg v The Corporation of London m d  
 Beattie v Lord Ebury c, wit (day to be fixed)  
 Hargreaves v Hall m d  
 Imray v Imeson sp c  
 Miller v Miller sp c  
 Gompertz v Kensit m d  
 Gray v Seckham sp c  
 Moore v Harper, Harper v Harper f c  
 Gillman v Bish f c  
 Bovill v Frost c, evidence viva voce at hearing  
 Brandon v Coleman c, pro confesso  
 Bemish v Hare m d  
 Preston v Mayor, &c., of Gt. Yarmouth, c  
 Spilling v Skoyles m d  
 The Leicester Waterworks Co. v Gimson m d  
 Vertue v Miller m d  
 Grove v Marshall m d  
 Meredith v Ruse m d  
 Savile v Kilner m d  
 Wilson v Lloyd m d  
 Levick v Noble m d  
 Harrop v Hirst m d  
 Thomas v Caddick m d  
 Constable v Turner m d  
 Kelson v Watts c, wit (day to be fixed)  
 Forbes v Williams c  
 The Agra Bank (Limited) v Northcott m d  
 Martin v Martin m d  
 Cameron v Somerville c

Kingston v The Cowbridge Ry Co. m d  
 Humphreys v Hodgson c  
 Garcia v Pochin c  
 Warner v Warner m d  
 Bigg v The Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London m d  
 Kent v Ingoldby m d  
 Robinson v Barret c (not before Nov 17)  
 White v Watkins c  
 Wooler v Wooler m d  
 Reed v Markcrow m d  
 Cooper v Lorenz m d  
 Kent v Spokes c  
 Motion v Moojen c  
 Gough v Smith m d  
 Calthorp v Rummenas m d  
 Rucker v Dobbyn m d  
 Hopkinson v Hopkinson m d  
 Telford v The Metropolitan Board of Works m d  
 Leahy v Barry m d  
 Ferneley v Buckley m d  
 The Peninsular, West Indian & Southern Bank (limited) v The London General Omnibus Company limited f c  
 Brown v Lindsay f c  
 Harfield v Bower m d  
 Hunter v Bullock f c  
 Allhusen v Whittell f c  
 Viscount Newry v Earl of Kilmorey c evidence viva voce at hearing  
 Bowyer v White f c  
 Tisley v Tagg f c  
 Ingleby v Ingleby m d  
 Haslam v Eastwood m d  
 Price v White f c & sums to vary  
 The Gresham Life Assurance Society v Crossman c  
 Hudson v Cook m d  
 Baskett v Steel f c  
 In re C. F. George's Estate. Neame v George. Clarke v George f c & sums to vary  
 Gumm v Hallett f c  
 Lacon, Bart v The Provincial Banking Corporation, limited m d  
 The Provincial Banking Corporation limited v Tillett f c  
 Cobbett v Woodward m d  
 Jerred v Berry m d  
 Parry v Murray c  
 The Central Bank of London, limited v Quail c  
 Matterson v Baerselman f c  
 King v Engelback c

## Before the Vice-Chancellor WICKENS.

## Causes, &amp;c.

Richardson v Dibb dem  
 Nicholson v Catt dem  
 Sykes v Sykes dem  
 Holmes v Symons plea  
 Briggs v Upton dem  
 Attorney-General v Johnstone exons for insufficiency  
 Rigg v Merrin dem  
 Browne v Radford dem  
 Thomas v Richardson f c  
 Richardson v Hodgetts m d  
 In re Thompson's Estate, Stockdale v Thompson f c  
 Teague v Teague c  
 Bower v Smith f c  
 Orchard v Lake c, with wit  
 Martin v Saunders m d (S. O.)  
 Catt v Tourle c, evidence viva voce at hearing  
 Russell v Martin m d  
 Pearce v Carrington m d  
 Brodick v Hewby c  
 Miller v Campbell m d  
 Taylor v Miller m d  
 Bass v Adams m d  
 Surry v Slater m d  
 Ayre v Eager m d

Griffiths v Oakley c wit  
 Veley v Wells m d  
 Ashton v Corrigan m d  
 Faith v Emsley m d  
 Wildman v Newby m d  
 The Hampshire Banking Co v Moody m d  
 Parkin v Parkin m d  
 Bourdin v Greenwood m d  
 French v Mayhew m d  
 Bond v Farmer m d  
 Torr v Thomas c, with wit  
 Alexander v Shorland c  
 Savage v Tyers sp c  
 Hext v Gill m d  
 Soffe v Prince c  
 Saul v Saul c  
 Jacobs v Rylands c, wit  
 Walker v Jersey Waterworks Co. (Limited) c  
 Alexander v Palmer m d  
 Fawcett v Billings m d  
 Allen v Mew m f d  
 Bianchi v Mackley c, wits  
 Russell v Tallerman c  
 Heffer v Lee c

Griesiell v Jackson m d  
 with wits  
 Walker v Lawton m d  
 Hopkins v Coleman c, pro confesso  
 Mellersh v Faulkner m d  
 Barnard v Clark m d  
 Flower v Flower m d  
 Harvey v Jannings c  
 Bennett v Partridge c  
 Rapley v Walmsley m d  
 Paine v Price c  
 Nesham v Selby m d  
 Holmes v Holmes m d  
 Packer v Page m d  
 Shelley v Maber m d  
 Penistan v Worsley c  
 Sherwin v Bodill m d  
 Stafford v Stafford c  
 Butterfield v Terry s c  
 Cooper v Aves m d  
 Shorland v Bertram m d  
 Armitage v Armitage m d  
 Cannock v Cannock m d  
 Phillips v Brookes m d  
 Robinson v Grave m d  
 Bontoft v Wilson m d  
 Leggett v Scott s c  
 Spyer v Haswell m d  
 Flower v Flower m d  
 Lloyd v Tozer m d  
 Miller v Miller m d  
 Johnson v Bott m d  
 Piper v Mann f c s  
 Marquess of Downshire v Bellyse pro confesso  
 Finnis v Tuke f c  
 Morgan v Seaton m d

In re Brown. Rattey v Hallah f c  
 Rattey v Jackson f c  
 Phillips v Silvester m d  
 Master v Richards m d  
 Rousseau v Smith f c  
 Mure v Mure sp c  
 Stubbs v Smith f c  
 Fulton v Wilson m d  
 Bland v Gayford f c  
 Baggs v Tompson f c  
 Earl of Dudley v Gye m d  
 Stonehouse v Dobing f c (short)  
 Grinstead v Lucas m d  
 Samuel v Page c  
 Jacobs v Jacobs m d  
 Alecock v Connop m d  
 Gardener v Jewers m d  
 Butler v Webb f c & sums  
 J. Mitchell & Co., limited v Great Northern Railway Co. c  
 Arnold v Bradbury trial before the Court without a jury  
 Simpson v Hempson f c  
 Clarke v Pike f c  
 Shiers v Haswell m d  
 Cock v Green f c  
 Best v Standeven f c  
 Reed v Southgate m d  
 Godrich v Fowler m d  
 Hall v Ramsbottom m d  
 Johnston v Kelley m d  
 Nickless v Owen m d with wits by order  
 Taylor v Taylor c  
 Golding v Wright c  
 Cundall v Proctor m d  
 Griffiths v Jones m d

## COURT OF PROBATE,

AND

## COURT FOR DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

Sittings in and after Michaelmas Term, 1871.

Trials before the Court—Nov. 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25.

The causes in the Court of Probate will be taken first.

Full Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, Nov. 9.

Trials by Jury—Nov. 29, 30; Dec. 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22.

The causes in the Court of Probate will be taken first unless otherwise ordered.

The judge will sit in chambers to hear summonses at eleven o'clock, and in court for motions at twelve o'clock, on Nov. 7, and on each succeeding Tuesday, until Dec. 19 inclusive.

All papers for motions must be left with the clerk of the papers before two o'clock on the Thursday before the motion is to be heard.

**LORD BLACKFORD.**—The Right Hon. Sir Frederic Rogers Bart., K.C.M.G. late Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, has been raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Blackford, of Wisdome, in the county of Devon. The new peer was educated at Eton, and at Oriel College, Oxford, where he attained a double first-class in 1832, and was elected to a Craven university scholarship, an Oriel fellowship, and a Vinerian law scholarship and fellowship, &c. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1837, and took the degree of D.C.L. next year. He was appointed registrar of joint stock companies in 1845, and a colonial land and emigration commissioner in 1846. In 1857 he became assistant-commissioner for the sale of encumbered estates in the West Indies, and in May, 1860, was appointed permanent Under-Secretary of State at the Colonial Office, which position he resigned a few months ago, when he was sworn a member of the Privy Council. In 1869 he was created a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. Three of his Lordship's predecessors in the baronetcy filled the office of Recorder of Plymouth—namely, Sir John Rogers, M.P., the second baronet, who died 1743-4; his son, Sir Frederick Rogers, fourth baronet, who died in 1772; and his son, Sir Frederick Leman Rogers, M.P., fifth baronet, who died in 1797, and was grandfather of the newly-created peer.



PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, NOV. 3, 1871.

From the Official List of the actual business transacted.

3 per Cent. Consols, 93	Annuities, April, '85
Ditto for Account, Dec. 3, 93	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced 91½	Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 7 p m
New 3 per Cent., 91½	Ditto, £500, Do — 7 p m
Do. 3 per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, — 7 p m
Do. 3 per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 4½ p
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year) 239
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 104 p Ct. Apr. '74, 206	Ind. Ent. Pr., 5 p Ct., Jan. '79 100
Ditto for Account	Ditto, 54 per Cent., May, '79 109
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '86 112½	Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
Ditto for Account, —	April, '64 —
Ditto, 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 102½	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 103
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000 20 p m
Ditto Enfranch Ppr., 4 per Cent. 96	Ditto, ditto, under £1000, 20 p m

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter .....	100	102
Stock	Caledonian .....	100	119
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	114
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	46½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2 .....	100	—
Stock	Great Northern .....	100	135
Stock	Do., A Stock .....	100	158
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	106
Stock	Great Western—Original .....	100	109
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	135
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	68½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	24½
Stock	London and North-Western .....	100	145½
Stock	London and South-Western .....	100	108½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	68½
Stock	Metropolitan .....	100	76
Stock	Midland .....	100	139
Stock	North British .....	100	103
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby .....	100	61
Stock	North London .....	100	125
Stock	North Staffordshire .....	100	74½
Stock	South Devon .....	100	70
Stock	South-Eastern .....	100	96½
Stock	Taff Vale .....	100	160

\* A receives no dividend until 5 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The money market presents the singular circumstance of a Bank of England Discount rate at 5 per cent. while the joint stock banks are doing business at 3½. Foreign securities have somewhat improved this week. Railways on the whole, ditto. The markets are generally firm.

The prospectus of the Bessemer Steel and Ordnance Company (Limited) states that the company has been formed for the manufacture of Bessemer Steel, the steadily increasing demand for which greatly exceeds the present means of supply, and also for the manufacture of wrought iron, steel, and compound guns for siege and naval purposes, together with any class of field guns and carriages, mitrailleurs, shot, shell, and other projectiles, as well as small arms. The capital is £100,000 in 10,000 shares of £10 each. The directors have rented the existing premises on a commanding position on the Thames, built a few years ago by Henry Bessemer, Esq., where are already fixed a pair of 40-horse engines, boilers, steam hammers, with steel-converting apparatus, embodying the latest improvements, and also a large quantity of machinery, plant, and tools, fixed and ready to commence work almost immediately.

It is rumoured that in consequence of the dissolution of the interests of the owners of the Emma Silver Mine, it is about to be formed into an English company. The earnings of this mine are stated to have been for some time back £3,000 per diem net profit.

The Pontefract County Court has been detached from Circuit No. 14, of which Mr. T. H. Marshall is judge, and placed under the jurisdiction of Mr. Sergeant Tindal Atkinson, the recently-appointed judge of Circuit No. 12.

THE LINCOLN COUNTY COURT JUDGESHIP.—On learning of the death of Mr. J. G. Teed, Q.C., judge of the Lincoln County Courts, the attorneys and solicitors practising in the Circuit forwarded memorials to the Lord Chancellor in favour of the appointment of Mr. W. C. Fooks, Q.C., to the

vacant judgeship. Mr. Fooks had been acting as Deputy-Judge, and on the sitting of the Lincoln County Court on the 26th October, Mr. Tweed, solicitor, on behalf of the profession in the city, expressed deep regret that one so eminently qualified as Mr. Fooks, and who had won the esteem of the legal practitioners and suitors of the Court, had not been selected by his Lordship. Mr. Tweed also alluded to the necessity of having a resident judge in consequence of the large amount of important business now transacted in the county courts. Mr. Fooks, in acknowledging the consideration and good feeling which had prompted the memorialists in the step they had taken, fully concurred in the suggestion as to the necessity of the county court judge being locally resident, and recommended them to lay their views before the Lord Chancellor, who he was sure would give them his most careful attention. He thanked them most cordially for the kindness and courtesy which had been extended to him during his recent visit to Lincoln as Deputy-Judge, and assured them that he should always regard the same as one of the most pleasing episodes of his professional experience.

THE CITY OF LONDON COURT.—This Court, which usually closes in August, and remains shut until October, was, under a new arrangement of the Corporation, opened for the dispatch of business during the vacation month of September, when Mr. R. A. Fisher sat as deputy judge. Some idea of the importance and value of this vacation sitting (which, it is to be hoped, will now become "a rule of Court") may be gathered from the fact that the learned judge disposed of 1,782 cases. Of these 1,572 were new; 78 were judgment summonses; 123 were adjournments, applications, and new trials; 6 were admiralty cases; and 2 were issues from superior courts. Four cases were tried by juries, and three written judgments were delivered in important questions of admiralty jurisdiction. The Corporation is entitled to the thanks of the mercantile community for setting an example which might be followed with advantage at Westminster.—City Press.

LEGAL MATTERS IN CHICAGO.—The members of the bar are most of them ruined. Not a single law office remains, either in the North or South Divisions of the city. The law offices on the West side, which number some five or six, are still left, but their libraries are very small. We believe several gentlemen on the south side, who had libraries at their homes as well as their offices, have succeeded in saving them. A large number of the members of the bar are without offices—without books—without money—without business, and with no immediate prospect of any. Most of the insurance companies in which they insured their houses, libraries, and other property, are bankrupt, and the hope they entertain of being able to support themselves and families by the money derived from their insurance, in case they should suffer from the hand of the fire king, has vanished, and they find they have been leaning on a broken reed. Truly, the attorneys of Chicago deserve not only the sympathy of their brethren throughout the nation, but such aid as can be rendered them. The records of the courts, State and Federal, have been consumed as well as the records and deeds. So far as we were able to see from personal inspection, the only records saved are those of the office of City Tax Commissioner. We are not now able to say whether Mr. C. N. Holden, the Commissioner, is entitled to the credit of preserving these records or not. It was owing to their being placed in a well-constructed vault, instead of being left in large rooms as the county records were. Every volume of the library of the Chicago Law Institute, which was the pride of the bar of the West, was destroyed.—Chicago Legal News.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

COOPER.—On Oct. 29, at Woodridings, Pinner, the wife of Edward Brodie Cooper, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a son.

GUSH.—On Nov. 1, at 1, Ormonde-terrace, Regent's-park, N.W., the wife of William F. Gush, Esq., of a daughter.

MUNTON.—On Oct. 30, at 21, Montague-street, Russell-square, the wife of Francis Keridge Munton, of 3, Old Fish-street-hill, Queen Victoria-street, City, solicitor, of a daughter.

DEATHS.

GREENWOOD.—On Nov. 1, at 14, Wesbourne-terrace, Hyde-park, Thomas Greenwood, Esq., M.A., Camb., F.R.S.L., a Benchor of Gray's-inn, in his 81st year.

PRESTON—On Oct. 21, at Oxtou, Cheshire, Jno. B. Preston, Esq., solicitor, Liverpool.  
ROBOTHAM—On Oct. 27, at Derby, William Robotham, Esq., solicitor, in his 72nd year.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

Stibbard, Geo D, & Wm Beck, East India-avenue, Leadenhall-st, Attorneys and Solicitors. Oct 23

## Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Evans's, Covent Garden (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 24, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins, on Nov 10. Merriman & Co., Queen-st, Cannon-st, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1871.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Cramer & Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 28, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Wickens, on Nov 10. Pead, Storey's-gate, Westminster, solicitor for the petitioners.  
Poltesco Marble Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 3, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Wickens, on Nov 10. Wood, Fenchurch-st, solicitor for the petitioners.

## Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

Adeshead, Thos Sidebottom, Nov 25. White v Adeshead. Registrar, Cross-st-chambers, Manch

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1871.

Penny, Robt, Lytham, Lancashire., Nov 13. Penny v Penny, Registrar, Cross-st-chambers, Manch

## Creditors under 22 &amp; 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

Ash, Louisa, Worcester, Spinster. Feb 23. Jones & Son, Worcester  
Barrow, Edw, Wedmore, Somerset, Surgeon. Dec 23. Barow, Pavial, Park-rd, Dalston  
Baxter, Geo, Skirbeck, Lincoln, Gent. Nov 29. Staniland & Wigelsworth, Boston  
Brocklehurst, Thos, Hurdfield, nr Macclesfield, Cheshire, Esq. Nov 27. Brocklehurst & Co, Macclesfield  
Chamberlain, Edw Hughes, Norfolk-st, Park-lane, Esq. Nov 30. Pyke & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields  
Chitty, Thos, Margate, Kent, Greengrocer. Nov 20. Isaacson, Margate  
Darby, Hy Wm, Regent-st, Lambeth, Firework Manufacturer. Dec 1. Webb & Co, Arkyl-street, Regent-st  
Ede, Fanny, Fairfield, Newbridge Hill, nr Bath, Widow. Dec 14. Ede, Sidmouth  
Farrow, Robinson, Alford, Lincoln, Solicitor. Jan 1. Mason, Alford  
Farrow, Wm, Alford, Lincoln, Solicitor. Jan 1. Mason, Alford  
Green, John, Hatch-lf-upon-Thames, Nottingham, Gent. Dec 10. Martin, Nottingham  
Hadley, Isaac, Handsworth, Stafford, Gent. Dec 1. Barlow & Smith, Birm  
Hart, John, Essex-st, Islington, Gent. Dec 31. Stileman & Neate, Southampton-st, Bloomsbury-sq  
Holbarne, Alicia Sophia Anne, Bath, Spinster. Nov 30. Carlisle & Ordell, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn  
Luscombe, Rev Edmd Peard, Melbecks, York. Nov 13. Tomlin, Richmond  
Mallen, Joseph, Round Oak, Stafford, Spade Manufacturer. Nov 17. Pearson & Co, Stourbridge  
McCartney, Geo, Lpool, Watch Finisher. Dec 15. Harvey & Alsop, Lpool  
Medhurst, John, Lewisham-hill, Blackheath, Esq. Nov 29. Davis, Charles-sq, Hoxton  
Morrison, Jane, Snarebrook, Essex, Widow. Dec 8. Weymouth, Essex-st, Strand  
Noyes, Sarah, Christchurch-rd, Brixton. Dec 1. Van Sandau & Cumming, King-st, Chespiade  
Park, Mary Ann, Preston, Lancashire, Widow. Nov 21. Banks & Dean, Preston  
Parsons, Elias, Darlington, Durham, Gent. Nov 30. Hutchinson & Lucas  
Phillips, Alfred, Carter-st, Walworth, Clerk. Nov 24. Vyner, Cook-st  
Pinnington, Squire, Nottingham, Engine Fitter. Dec 6. Belk, Nottingham  
Quinton, Ishmael Catchpole, Jonson's-pl, Harrow-rd, Victualler. Nov 23  
Child, Paul's Bakehouse-ct, Doctors'-commons  
Russell, Frase Wm, Lancaster-gate, Merchant. Dec 14. Thomas & Hallams, Mincing-lane  
Smith, Edw Heathcote, Dover, Kent, Esq. Dec 1. Andrews & Pope, Dorchester  
Smith, Henry, Birm, Auctioneer. Dec 1. Barlow & Smith, Birm  
Smith, Hy John, Fairwater, Somerset, Esq. Nov 14. Cwralake & Barham, Bridgwater  
Staveley, Sarah, Kildare-gdns, Bayswater, Widow. Nov 30. Farrer & Co, Lincoln's-inn-fields  
Tippie, Woodward, Cambridge Heath, Hackney, Licensed Victualler. Dec 1. Cole, Vauxhall-bridge-rd, Pimlico  
Wade, Wm Thos, Gt Dummow, Essex, Solicitor. Dec 31. Wade & Knocker, Gt Dummow  
Williams, Wm, Oxbill, Stafford, Ironmaster. Dec 30. Ingleby & Co, Birm

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1871.

Bowen, Thos, Bahaltton, Montgomery, Tailor. Dec 30. Rowlands, Newtown  
Chivers, Ann, Devizes, Wilt, Spinster. Dec 1. Norris, Devizes  
Cook, Wm, Edmontou, Farm Bailiff. Dec 10. Marsden & Chubb, Friday-st  
Eley, John, Toppsfield, Essex, Farmer. Dec 25. Stedman, Sudbury  
Fraser, Jas Wm, Kensington Palace-gdns, Esq. Nov 30. Milne & Co, Harcourt-bldgs, Temple  
Gordon, Jas Gabriel, Southsea, Rear Admiral. Dec 1. Woodhead & Co, Charing-cross  
Hufford, Ellis, Mayfield Lodge, Brixton, Spinster. Dec 10. Marsden & Chubb, Friday-st  
Lee, Saml, Dudley, Worcester, Baker. Dec 5. Lowe, Dudley  
Little, John Davis, Biddestone, Wilts, Gent. Nov 27. Keary & Co, Chippenhams  
Lodder, Thos, Devonshire-rd, Holloway. Dec 7. Coode & Co, Bedford-row  
Matthews, Joseph, Medley Farm, Oxford, Farmer. Nov 30. Walls, Walbrook  
McLachlan, Colin Bullen, Baddow, Essex, Esq. Dec 14. Holmes, Finsbury-pl, South  
Meyer, Philip Herman, Stondon Massey, Essex, Esq. Dec 1. Norcutt, Gray's-inn-sq  
Parker, Joseph John, Worcester, Commercial Traveller. Nov 30  
Parker & Galdingham, Worcester  
Platt, Robt, Pentibyddyn, Flint, Surgeon. Dec 1. Byrom, Wigan  
Reeve, John, Bewdley, Worcester, Gent. Jan 1. Marcey, Bewdley  
Renshaw, Frase Bennett, Lieut. R.N. Nov 27. Woodhead & Co, Charing-cross  
Seabrook, Wm, Boreham, Essex, Farmer. Dec 9. Duffield & Bruty, Chelmsford  
Simonds, Robt White, Hampton-in-Arden, Warwick, Gent. Dec 1. Whateley & Whateley, Birm  
Stopford, Mary Eliz, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Widow. Jan 1. Brydges & Mellersh, Cheltenham  
Ward, Harriet Maria, Southampton, Widow. Dec 16. Plumbe, Winchcomb  
Westwood, Joseph, Leeds, Corn Miller. Dec 27. Horsfall & Latimer, Leeds  
Whendon, John, Crewkerne, Somerset, Yeoman. Nov 21. Sparks, Crewkerne  
Wood, Joseph, Walsall, Stafford, Malster. Sept 28. Langham & Son, Hastings

## Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Phillips, W R, Piccadilly, no occupation. Pet Oct 24. Roche. Nov 17 at 12.30  
Taylor, Frase Wm, Coleman-st, General Agent. Pet Oct 24. Roche. Nov 16 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Binns, Joshua, Whitefield, Lancashire, Coach Proprietor. Pet Oct 25. Holden. Bolton, Nov 13 at 10  
Chadwick, John, & Geo Turner, Haywood, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturers. Pet Oct 25. Holden. Bolton, Nov 8 at 10.30  
Furness, Robt, Church, nr Accrington, Lancashire, Oil Merchant. Pet Oct 23. Bolton. Blackburn, Nov 8 at 11  
Hinkley, Arden, Sittingbourne, Kent, Brickmaker. Pet Oct 23. Acworth. Rochester, Nov 10 at 12  
Hoddnott, Frase, Frome, Somerset, Dealer. Pet Oct 24. Messiter. Frome, Nov 8 at 3  
Morley, John, Kufforth, York, Farmer. Pet Oct 25. Perkins. York Nov 9 at 2  
Parker, Chas, Huddersfield, York, Tea Dealer. Pet Oct 25. Jones, jun. Huddersfield, Nov 16 at 11  
Robinson, Wm, Scarborough, York, Chemist. Pet Oct 25. Woodall. Scarborough, Nov 13 at 3  
Simms, Geo, Wantage, Berks, Cordwainer. Pet Oct 23. Bishop. Oxford, Nov 10 at 12  
Thelenberg, Joseph, Oromwell-ter, Battersea-pk, Butcher. Pet Oct 24. Willoughby. Wandsworth, Nov 10 at 11  
Walker, Wm, Holbeck, Leeds, Butcher. Pet Oct 21. Marshall. Leeds, Nov 16 at 11

TUESDAY, Oct. 24, 1871.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in the Country.

Briggs, Jas, Yendon, York, Machinist. Pet Oct 26. Marshall. Leeds, Nov 16 at 11  
Curry, Jane, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Builder. Pet Oct 26. Mortimer. Newcastle, Nov 14 at 12  
Earle, Oswald, Lpool, Merchant. Pet Oct 17. Watson. Lpool, Nov 14 at 2  
Fox, Jas Abraham, Doddington-grove, Battersea. Pet Oct 27. Willoughby. Wandsworth, Nov 10 at 12  
Parkerson, Hy Mount, Portsmouth, Lieut. 82nd Reg. Pet Oct 11. Howard. Portsmouth, Nov 11 at 12  
Partington, Geo, Bridlington, York, Innkeeper. Pet Oct 28. Woodall. Scarborough, Nov 22 at 3  
Williamson, Jas, Manch, Paper Merchant. Pet Oct 26. Kay. Manch, Nov 29 at 2.30

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

Rayne, Edw Fletcher, Rothampton, Surrey, Gent. Oct 10  
Whitecomb, Edwin, Church-rd, Croydon, Licensed Victualler. Oct 23

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1871.

Story, Thos Frase, Leeds, out of business. Oct 26

**Liquidation by Arrangement.  
FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.**

FRIDAY, Oct. 27, 1871.

Alger, Fredk Augustus, Portsea, Hants, Provision Merchant. Nov 9 at 12, at offices of Slattery & Co, Wellington-chambers, London-bridge.  
 Felham, Portsea.  
 Allen, Fredk, Hollywell, Flint, Chemist. Nov 10 at 3, at offices of Cartwright, Bridge-st-row, Chester.  
 Arthur, John, Ferry-side, Carmarthen, Weaver. Nov 7 at 2, at the Townhall, Carmarthen. Lloyd, Haverfordwest.  
 Ashton, Fras Wm, Manch, Merchant. Nov 14 at 3, at offices of Ashton & Co, Mosley-st, Manch. Brooks & Co, Manch.  
 Aylott, Jas, Gt Titchfield-st, St Mary, Corn Dealer. Nov 4 at 12, at office of Webster, Basinghall-st.  
 Barker, Fredk, & Walter Langford Sainsbury, Tendring, Essex, Brewers. Nov 20 at 11, at office of Smith, North-hill, Colchester.  
 Bartlett, Jas, Margate, Kent, Grocer. Nov 14 at 1, at office of Moss, Gracechurch-st.  
 Benson, Wm, Kirkham, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Nov 9 at 1, at office of Buck & Dicksons, Winkley-st, Preston.  
 Bradshaw, Geo, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Clog Maker. Nov 11 at 11, at offices of Barrow, Queen-st, Wolverhampton.  
 Brown, Chas Miller, Witney, Oxford, Chemist. Nov 10 at 2, at office of Ablett, Cambridge-st, Hyde-pk.  
 Burnett, John, & Thos Weddall, Salford, Lancashire, Joiners. Nov 6 at 2.30, at offices of Addleshaw, King-st, Manch.  
 Bush, Clement, St George, Gloucester, Ironfounder. Nov 7 at 12, at office of Sherrard, Nicholas-st, Bristol.  
 Charldwood, Harry, Compton-st, St John-st, Clerkenwell, Baker. Nov 7 at 2, at offices of Marshall, Hatton-garden.  
 Coleman, Chas, Long-la-ne, West Smithfield, Bootmaker. Nov 9 at 2, at office of Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
 Connolly, Jas, Birm, Baker. Nov 8 at 12, at office of Joynt, Moor-st, Birm.  
 Cooke, Thos, Altrincham, Cheshire, Grocer. Nov 8 at 4, at offices of Addleshaw, King-st, Manch.  
 Cotterell, John, Walsall, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 8 at 12, at offices of Griffin, Bennett's-hill, Birm.  
 Cousins, Edmd, Wokingham, Berks, Greengrocer. Nov 13 at 11, at office of Risling, Forbury, Reading.  
 Cowlin, Jas, Wigan, Lancashire, Milliner. Nov 15 at 11, at offices of Byron, King-st, Wigan.  
 Crocker, Joseph, Ramsgate, Kent, Sailmaker. Nov 9 at 3, at office of Mercer & Mercer, Conthall-st, Throgmorton-st. Edwards.  
 Crowthor, Reuben, Batley Carr, York, Joiner. Nov 8 at 3, at offices of Ibberston, Dewsbury.  
 Davies, Hy, Cardington, Salop, Farmer. Nov 11 at 12, at the Wrekin Hotel, Wellington. Marcy, Wellington.  
 Drake, Fras Edwin, Hincley, Leicester, Architect. Nov 10 at 12, at offices of Kirby, Market-st, Leicester.  
 Duncan, Jas, West Drayton, Middx, out of business. Nov 13 at 12, at the Guildhall Coffee-house, Gresham-st. Treherne & Wolferstan, Ironmonger Lane, Cheapside.  
 Evans, Evan John, Pellywhaid, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Contractor. Nov 6 at 2, at office of Linton & Lewis, Gleveland-st, Merthyr Tydfil.  
 Edge, Wm, Rusholme, nr Manch, Clerk. Nov 21 at 3, at offices of Ellithorpe, Princes-st, Manch.  
 Fox, Alfd, Charlton, Kent, Builder. Nov 7 at 11, at offices of Norman, Lancaster-pk, Strand.  
 Girling, Saml Jas, Bromley, Middx, Builder. Nov 10 at 3, at offices of Bath & Co, King William-st. Bridge & Collins, King William-st, London-bridge.  
 Gower, Mary Ann, Gray's-inn-rd, Grocer. Nov 10 at 11, at offices of Noton, Gt Swan-alley, Moorgate-st.  
 Grundy, Thos, Salford, Lancashire, out of business. Nov 9 at 11, at offices of Ritson, John Dalton-st, Manch.  
 Harborough, Alf, Southport, Lancashire, Music Seller. Nov 10 at 3, at offices of Forshaw & Hawkins, Sweeting-st, Lpool.  
 Hazell, Benj, Flood-st, Chelsea, Corn Dealer. Nov 10 at 1, at offices of Smyth, Rochester-row, Westminster.  
 Hoyle, Robt, Hollin Bank, Lancashire, Manufacturer. Nov 14 at 3, at offices of Grundy & Coulson, Booth-st, Manch.  
 Hurd, Fredk, Wakefield, York, Engineer. Nov 3 at 8, at the Stafford Arms Hotel, Wakefield. Gill, Wakefield.  
 Jones, Evan, New Quay, Cardigan, Shipowner. Nov 3 at 11, at the Townhall, Aberystwyth. Hughes.  
 Jones, John Gwyndaf, Pwllhel, Carmarvon, Grocer. Nov 9 at 2, at the British Hotel, Bangor. Jones & Jones, Portmadoc.  
 Lane, Sarah, Mortimer-st, Clarendon-sq, Milliner. Nov 6 at 3, at office of Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-flds.  
 Lawrence, Jas, Cheapside, Costume Manufacturer. Nov 3 at 12, at offices of Howell, Cheapside.  
 Lefort, Eugene, King's-rd, Chelsea, Upholsterer. Nov 13 at 12, at offices of Kynaston & Guesquet, King's Arms-yd, Moorgate-st.  
 Leo, Louis, Aberdeen Park-rd, Professor of Music. Nov 13 at 2, at offices of Barnett, New Broad-st.  
 Martin, Watson Wood, Birm, Brewer's Assistant. Nov 10 at 3, at offices of Rowlands, Ann-st, Birm.  
 Matthews, Hy John, jun, Newbury, Berks, Hairdresser. Nov 4 at 11, at the White Hart Newbury. Lucas, Newbury.  
 Montgomery, Donald, Swansae, Draper. Nov 13 at 2, at offices of Clifton, Corn-st, Bristol.  
 Moore, Fredk, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Carpenter. Nov 11 at 12, at offices of Barrow, Queen-st, Wolverhampton.  
 Moore, John, Birm, Tailor. Nov 10 at 3, at offices of Maher, Upper Temple-st, Birm.  
 Moorhouse, Joseph, Wakefield, York, Yarn Spinner. Nov 7 at 3, at offices of Fernandes & Gill, Cross-sq, Wakefield.  
 Morgan, Wm, Pendleton, Lancashire, Factory Operative. Nov 9 at 2, at offices of Hardy, St James's-sq, Manch.  
 Newsam, Wm, Nottingham, Milliner. Nov 8 at 12, at office of Belk, High-pavement, Nottingham.  
 Norton, Wm, Leicester, Builder. Nov 8 at 11, at office of Harvey, Pocklington's-walk, Leicester.  
 Paddock, Wm, Ellesmere, Salop, Hotelkeeper. Nov 14 at 3, at the George Hotel, Shrewsbury.

Page, Thos, Adelphi-ter, Strand, Civil Engineer. Nov 9 at 12, at the Caledonian Hotel, Robert-st, Adelphi. Smith, Adelphi-ter, Strand.  
 Parks, Wm, Maidstone, Kent, no occupation. Nov 8 at 12.30, at the Bridge House Hotel, London-bridge. Goodwin, Maidstone.  
 Pears, John, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Tanner. Nov 8 at 2, at office of Alter, New Lower, Whitehaven.  
 Pendlebury, John, Bradford, nr Manch, Grocer. Nov 13 at 3, at office of Ellithorpe, Princes-st, Manch.  
 Radley, Wm, Bethnal-green-rd, Olman. Nov 13 at 3, at offices of Piesse & Son, Old Jewry-chambers.  
 Robinson, Thos, Halifax, York, Tailor. Nov 13 at 3, at offices of Leeming, George-st, Halifax.  
 Scott, Wm, Swansae, Glamorgan, Greengrocer. Nov 3 at 3, at offices of Morris, Ratia, T, Swansea.  
 Sharp, Edwin, Skok, Jon-Trent, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 13 at 11, at offices of Sherratt, Market-st, Kidsgrove.  
 Sims, Alf Hy, Birm, Ammunition Manufacturer. Nov 10 at 11, at offices of Rowlands, Ann-st, Birm.  
 Smith, David Clarke, Heath-st, Hampstead, Boot Dealer. Nov 4 at 11, at offices of Johnson, Southampton-bldgs, Chancery-lane.  
 Stephens, Emma, Landport, Hants, Baker. Nov 9 at 2, at offices of Davis & Co, St James's-st, Portsea, Ford, Portsea.  
 Stubbs, Saml, Tunstall, Stafford, Bricklayer. Nov 10 at 3, at office of Salt, Tunstall.  
 Talbot, Trayton, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Butcher. Nov 10 at 12, at the County Court-office, Bank-bldgs, Hastings. Langham, Hastings.  
 Taylor, Jas, Exeter, Draper. Nov 14 at 11, at the White Lion Hotel, High-st, Exeter. Flood, Exeter.  
 Taylor, Riley, Halifax, York, Draper. Nov 8 at 12, at the Angel Hotel, Manch. Wavell & Co, Halifax.  
 Thomas, Danl, Petherton-rd, Highbury New Park, Builder. Nov 13 at 2, at offices of Cooke, Gresham-bldgs, Guildhall.  
 Vipan, Joseph Maylin, Ashton, Essex, Gent. Nov 9 at 11, at offices of Ellison, Alexandra-st, Petty Cur, Cambridge.  
 Wales, Philip, Crewe, Cheshire, Shoe Dealer. Nov 13 at 3, at the Royal Hotel, Nantwich-rd, Crewe. Salt, Tunstall.  
 Watson, Saml, Tunstall, Stafford, Tailor. Nov 17 at 2, at office of Llewellyn, Piccadilly-st, Tunstall.  
 Wearn, Ellis, Landport, Hants, Grocer. Nov 10 at 11, at offices of Walker, Union-st, Portsea.  
 West, Edwd, Storrington, Sussex, Farmer. Nov 20 at 1, at the Half Moon Inn, Storrington. Mills, Brighton.  
 Wilde, Wm Knowles, Manch, Linen Draper. Nov 15 at 3, at offices of Blain & Chorlton, Brazenose-st, Manch.  
 Wimbush, John Benj, Milford, Pembroke, Ship Builder. Nov 6 at 2, at office of Lloyd, Haverfordwest.  
 Woolaway, John, Bow, Devon, Mason. Nov 14 at 11, at offices of Friend, Post Office-chambers, Queen-st, Exeter.  
 Youle, Geo Smith, Doncaster, York, Builder. Nov 9 at 2, at the Elephant Inn, St Sepulchre-gate Within. Burdakin & Co, Sheffield.  
 Young, John Shepherd, Wilson-st, Gray's-inn-rd, House Decorator. Nov 9 at 3, at offices of Marshall, Hatton-garden.

TUESDAY, Oct. 31, 1871.

Alderton, Horatio Geo, Wandsworth-rd, Grocer. Nov 13 at 3, at 265, Tottenham-court-rd.  
 Armstrong, Joseph, Seaham Harbour, Durham, Draper. Nov 21 at 2, at offices of Wright, John-st, Sunderland.  
 Bacroft, John, Hanley, Stafford, Basket Maker. Nov 9 at 11, at offices of Tennant, Hanley.  
 Bartlett, Robt, Torquay, Devon, Corn Factor. Nov 11 at 11, at the Corn Exchange Hotel, Market-st, Exeter. Flood, Exeter.  
 Bayly, Thos, King Edward-st, Liverpool-rd, out of business. Nov 10 at 3, at 14, Bedford-row. Hicks, Francis-ter, Victoria-pk.  
 Bradley, Wm John, & Jas Grundy, Lpool, Bakers. Nov 15 at 3, at offices of Nordon, Cook-st, Lpool.  
 Brown, Wm Fraser, Carlisle, Tobaccoist. Nov 13 at 11, at offices of Thornburn, Bank-st, Carlisle.  
 Bull, Jas Porter, Dewsbury, York, Coach Builder. Nov 13 at 3, at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury.  
 Bulkin, John, Ipswich, Suffolk, Organ Builder. Nov 21 at 12, at office of Pollard, St Lawrence-st, Ipswich.  
 Clarke, Robt Robinson, Gateshead, Durham, Chemist. Nov 9 at 12, at offices of Hoyle & Co, Mosley-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
 Collett, Wm, Beaumont-st, Marylebone, Gent. Nov 10 at 3, at offices of Montagu, Bucklersbury.  
 Coverdale, Wm, Hartlepool, Durham, Publican. Nov 15 at 11, at offices of Doring & Simpson, Church-st, West Hartlepool.  
 Davies, Chas, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. Nov 11 at 11, at offices of Clayton, George-st, Ashton-under-Lyne.  
 Davies, Wm, Carmarthen, Stonecutter. Nov 7 at 2, at the Townhall, Carmarthen.  
 Dobson, Thos, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Linen Draper. Nov 14 at 10, at offices of Thompson, Finkle-st, Stockton-on-Tees.  
 Downer, Wm, Brighton, Sussex, Tea Merchant. Nov 14 at 12, at offices of Clennell, Gt Knight Rider-st, Doctor's-commons. Brandreth, Brighton.  
 Earp, John, Hanley, Stafford, Milliner. Nov 8 at 3, at the King's Head Inn, Worcester-st, Birm. Tennant, Hanley.  
 Edmonds, Edmd, Birm, Woollen Draper. Nov 10 at 11, at the George Hotel, Huddersfield.  
 Farley, Wm, Ramsgate, Kent, Grocer. Nov 14 at 3, at offices of Moon, Pavement, Finsbury.  
 Hague, Benj, Leeds, Provision Dealer. Nov 10 at 11, at offices of Rooke & Midgley, Bank-bldgs, Boar-lane, Leeds.  
 Handcock, Jane Ellis, New-rd, Hammersmith. Nov 22 at 3, at offices of Ladbury & Co, Cheapside. Lewis, Ely-pl, Holborn.  
 Handford, Jas, Duke-st, Portland-pl, Confectioner. Nov 15 at 3, at offices of Wagstaff, Upper-st, Ilington. Elliott.  
 Hinchelliff, Jas, Huddersfield, Cloth Merchant. Nov 16 at 11, at offices of Clough & Son, Market-st, Huddersfield.  
 Hinchelliff, Jas, & Hy Tunaccliffe, Huddersfield, Woollen Cloth Merchants. Nov 15 at 11, at the Queen Hotel, Market-st, Huddersfield. Clough & Son.  
 Hoddinott, Hugh Geo, Marston Forest Farm, Somerset, Farmer. Nov 9 at 3, at offices of Dunn & Payne, King-st, Frouse.



Howells, Morgan, Rhosgoch, Cardigan, Butcher. Nov 9 at 11, at office of Jones, Pier-st, Aberystwyth.

Huntbath, John, Burslem, Stafford, Tailor. Nov 14 at 2, at offices of Hollishead, Market-st, Tunstall.

Hutchins, Edwd Fras, Gravesend, Kent, Builder. Nov 13, at 11, at office of Bower, Harmer-st, Gravesend.

Hushington, Marley Geo, Hampton Court Palace, Lieu. 8th Hussars. Nov 6 at 2, at offices of Pickard, St James's-st, Piccadilly. Burnard, St James's-st.

Jones, Evan, Llanwern, Glamorgan, Butcher. Nov 12, at 2, at the Bear Inn, Cowbridge. Thomas, Pontypridd.

Joynt, Eryn Dunham, Princess-rd, Notting-hill, out of business. Nov 14 at 2, at offices of Mote, Warwick-st, Gray's-inn.

Kay, Theo Young, Lpool, Auctioneer. Nov 8 at 2, at offices of Meadows & Crang, (and not Crang, as in the Gazette, Oct 24), Dale-st, Lpool.

Keppric, Saml, Bristol, Fancy Warehouseman. Nov 8 at 12, at offices of Clifton, Corn-st, Bristol.

Mack, Hy, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, out of business. Nov 11 at 12, at office of Johnston, Pilgrim-st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Martin, Chas, Litchurch, Derby, Builder. Nov 14 at 3, at offices of Briggs, Full-st, Derby.

Masters, Wm, Rusholme, nr Manch, Auctioneer. Nov 13 at 2, at offices of Addleshaw, King-st, Manch.

McNair, Jas Brown, Heigham, Norwich, Draper. Nov 14 at 11, at office of Stanley, Bank-plaid, Norwich.

Middleton, Richd, Leeds, Engineer. Nov 13 at 3, at offices of Hick & Jones, Bond-st, Leeds.

Mills, Halford, Sandgate, Kent, Grocer. Nov 10 at 12, at offices of Carter & Bell, Leadenhall-st.

Minnett, Wm, & Wm Harris, King-st, Hammersmith, Grocers. Nov 16, at 12, at offices of Broad, Walbrook-bldgs. Watson & Sons, Bowdrie-st.

Morgan, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Chemist. Nov 13 at 12, at offices of St. David's & Co, Temple-st, Swansea.

Moses, John, Holben Bridge, York, Surveyor. Nov 10 at 2, at the Crown Hotel, Horton-st, Halifax.

Onley, Mary Ann, Norwich, Earthenware Dealer. Nov 10 at 12, at offices of Miller & Co, Bank-chambers, Norwich.

Owen, Jas, New Cross-rd, Grocer. Nov 13 at 3, at offices of Moon, Ravelement, Finsbury. Parker, Pavement, Finsbury.

Page, Thos, Adelphi-ter, Strand, Civil Engineer. Nov 9 at 12, at the Grosvenor Hotel, Robert-st, Adelphi. Strutt, Adelphi-ter, Strand.

Parish, John, Exeter, Builder. Nov 15 at 11, at offices of Huggins, Paul-st, Exeter.

Parsonage, Wm Roylance, Lpool, Fruiterer. Nov 16 at 3, at office of Masters & Fletcher, North John-st, Lpool.

Pickering, Wm, Birm, Grocer. Nov 11 at 11, at offices of Assinder, Union-st, Birm.

Pickthall, Thos Walter, Lpool, Provision Merchant. Nov 16 at 3, at the Clarendon Rooms, South John-st, Lpool. McConall, Jun, Lpool.

Piums, John, St John-st-rd, Clerkenwell, Coal Merchant. Nov 20 at 1, at 194, St John-st-rd, Clerkenwell. Popham, Vincent-ter, Islington.

Pulling, Robt, St Bene's-place, Gracechurch-st, Tin Plate Merchant. Nov 14 at 2, at offices of Courtney & Croome, Gracechurch-st.

Ravehill, Thos, Shirenewton, Monmouth, Wood Turner. Nov 14 at 12, at offices of Revan & Hancock, Welsh-st, Chepstow.

Reynolds, Edmund, High-rd, Tottenham, Baker. Nov 16 at 2, at 15, Finner's-hall, Old Broad-st, Stacpoles.

Rutter, Ebenezer, Astwood Bank, nr Redditch, Worcester, Draper. Nov 13 at 12, at office of Powell, Clarendon-chambers, Temple-st, Birm.

Shepherd, John Wm, & Geo Shaw, Bradford, York, Joiners. Nov 13 at 11, at offices of Lancaster, Manor-rd, Bradford.

Simpson, Hy, Manch, Woollen Merchant. Nov 17 at 3, at offices of Grundy & Coulson, Booth-st, Manch.

Skinner, Joseph, Fleet-st, Merchant Tailor. Nov 9 at 12, at offices of Downes, Cheapside.

Skinner, Wm, Farnworth, Lancaster, Joiner. Nov 13 at 3, at offices of Hall & Rutter, Acresfield, Bolton.

Smith, Hy Dunster, Taunton, Somerset, Reader at a Printing Office. Nov 14 at 12, at offices of Trenchard, Upper High-st, Taunton.

Snell, Hy, Birm, Grocer. Nov 10 at 12, at offices of Beaton, Victoria-bldgs, Temple-row, Birm.

Taylor, John, Northerton, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Nov 13 at 11, at offices of Forrest, Church-st, Oldbury.

Tidwell, Wm, Southport, Lancashire, Wine & Spirit Merchant. Nov 16 at 11-30, at the Temperance Hotel, London-st, Southport. Walton, Southport.

Tennant, Hy, Huddersfield, Cloth Merchant. Nov 16 at 12, at offices of Cough & Son, Market-st, Huddersfield.

Waters, Cornelius, Cirencester, Gloucester, Brewer. Nov 14 at 11, at offices of Mullings & Co, Park-st, Cirencester.

Watts, Hy Chas, Manch, Architect. Nov 16 at 3, at offices of Richardson, Princess-st, Manch.

Weatherill, Michael, Westbourne-grove, Draper. Nov 13 at 12, at offices of Read & Dangerfield, Milk-st, Cheapside. Davidson & Co, Basinghall-st.

Wilson, Thos, Darlington, Durham, Grocer. Nov 11 at 10, at offices of George Hudson, High-st, Stockton-on-Tees.

Wood, Chas Heaton, Tettenhall Wood, Stafford, Omnibus Proprietor. Nov 13 at 2, at offices of Langman, Queen-st, Wolverhampton.

Woods, Josias, Preston, Lancashire, Grocer. Nov 16 at 2.30, at offices of Eakleton, Winchley-st, Preston.

Wright, Codrie, Epping, Essex, Draper. Nov 13 at 12, at offices of Smith & Co, Broad-st, Cheapside.

Youldon, John Keene, Oakley-rd, Islington, Gent. Nov 23 at 3, at office of Snell, George-st, Mansion-house.

## ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—Professor Pepper's

New Lecture, "All about Gun Cotton," Dynamite and Litho-structure; with brilliant and needless Experiments, and Graphic Illustrations of the Catastrophe at Bowmarket, by Vick and Denesley.—Mr. George Green Smith, Janr's, New Sketch, The Silver Wedding; with humorous and amusing Illustrations.—A perfectly new and unique Illustration called the Arabian Mystery.—Novel and marvellous effects of the Electric Light under Water, by Messrs. Heintze and Davis.—Occasionally, Paris: as it was and is! by J. L. King, Esq., with songs by Miss Alice Barth.—Open daily from 12 to 5 and 7 to 10.—Admission One Shilling.

## THE NINETEENTH VOLUME of the WEEKLY

REPORTER is now presented to the Profession. In the continuance of the publication no effort will be spared to ensure the production of prompt and accurately framed reports of all decisions appropriate for reporting. Some decisions, from the nature of their subject-matter, require, in the interests of practitioners, exceptionally early reporting. Such cases will, as hitherto, be advanced with exceptional celerity. The efforts made in this direction have hitherto met with the approval of the Profession, and they will be prosecuted with unabated zeal, aided by the yearly augmenting experience of former years. The Digest includes, as before, a special column of references to articles in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL'S Department of "Recent Decisions." In these articles the more important decisions are from time to time reviewed, criticised where criticism seems needed, and assessed with regard to their bearing upon the law as previously existing.—Profaco.

## GRANT'S MORELLA CHERRY BRANDY

SUPPLIED TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

This delicious Liqueur, from the famous Kent Morella, supersedes Wine in many Households—is much favoured by Sportsmen, and is also recommended by the Medical Profession as a valuable tonic in cases of weakness. Order of any Wine Merchant, or direct of T. GRANT, Distillery, Maidstone. 42s. per dozen, cash. Carriage paid.

## LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

Most convenient, economical, and fine-flavoured stock for Beef Tea (about 24d. a pint). Soups, Sauces, and made dishes, costing hardly more than one-fourth of what it would when made of fresh meat; keeps good for any time even after jars being opened. lib. jars recommended, being relatively the cheapest size.

Now permanently used in most households in town and country.

CAUTION.—Ask for LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT, being the only sort warranted Genuine and Perfect by Baron Liebig, the Inventor, requiring his Signature on every Jar.

## A STRINGENT LOZENGES OF THE RED

GUM OF AUSTRALIA.—For Relaxed Throat, in Bottles, 2s.

MURIATE OF AMMONIA LOZENGES.

In Bottles, 2s. Useful for Bronchitis, by loosening the phlegm and preventing violent fits of coughing.

P. & F. W. SQUIRE,

Chemists on the Establishment in Ordinary to THE QUEEN.

Gazetted August 8th, 1857—December 31st, 1867.)

277, OXFORD STREET, LONDON.

## MILNER'S STBONG HOLDFAST and FIRE-

RESISTING SAFES, Strong Box Doors, &c., with all the recent improvements. Price Lists, Drawings, and Testimonials free by post.—Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield, and 47a, Moorgate-street, City, London.

## SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON.—The Papers.

Issued by the Board can be had by ORDER of

YATES & ALEXANDER,

PRINTERS to the LONDON SCHOOL BOARD, Symonds-inn, Chancery-lane.

## The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use MEMORANDA and ARTICLES of ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

## Solicitors' Account Books.

## ASH & FLINT,

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn).

## PRINTING of EVERY DESCRIPTION, Legal,

Parliamentary and General—Newspapers, Books, Pamphlets, Prospectuses, Circulars, &c.—with promptitude and at moderate charges, by

YATES & ALEXANDER, Symonds-inn (and Church-passage), Chancery-lane.

## BILLS of COMPLAINT.

BILLS of COMPLAINT, 5/6 per page for 20 copies, from which price a large discount will be allowed if cash is paid immediately on completion of order.

YATES & ALEXANDER, Law Printers, Symonds-inn, Chancery-lane.

## THE LAW OF TRADE MARKS, with some

account of its History and Development in the Decisions of the Courts of Law and Equity. By EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. Price 3s.

"I am indebted to the very valuable little publication of Mr. Lloyd, who has collected all the authorities on this subject."—V.C. Woon, in MeAndrew v. Bassett, March 4.

12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.